LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

THE Nation

VOLUME 147 NEW YORK • SATURDAY • NOVEMBER 26, 1938 NUMBER 22

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 549

EDITORIALS:

HOPE AND DESPAIR IN EUROPE 552
THE TASK BEFORE US 553
C. I. O. PEACE TERMS 554

KENNEDY AND THE JEWS
by a Special Correspondent 555

CONTINENTAL DEFENSE" by Paul Y. Anderson 556

LAGUE'S ARMY FALLS BACK
by McAlister Coleman 557

PAIN'S SCHEDULE OF WAR
by Lawrence A. Fernsworth 560

THE LEAGUE AND THE SWASTIKA
by Robert Dell 562

IBERAL'S DEFEAT—A CASE HISTORY
by John E. Kennedy 564

OCKET GUIDE by Helen Woodward 565

N THE WIND 566

SSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 567

OOKS AND THE ARTS:

BOMBS AND PHILOSOPHY by Robert Morss Lovett 568
RISE OR FALL? by Elizabeth Wiskemann 568
PORTRAIT OF LILLIAN WALD
by Clara Gruening Stillman 569
DUNANT AND THE RED CROSS by Albert Guérard 570
OPERA INTO TRACT by Philip Rahv 571
DRAMA: ATTENTION DIES COMMITTEE
by Joseph Wood Krutch 572
FILMS by Franz Hoellering 574

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor — . R. BENDINER
Literary Editor — MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON
MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL C. GRAY

The Shape of Things

*

CERTAIN STARTLING FACTS EMERGE FROM the story we publish this week on the behavior of Mr. Kennedy in the matter of the German refugees, facts which raise the pertinent question—Whom does our Ambassador in London represent, anyhow? First, it took a cable from President Roosevelt and a nation-wide pogrom in Germany to bend the Kennedy-Chamberlain axis. Second, the news of the President's effort to jolt his Ambassador into action was not, as far as we can learn, published in the United States. Why wasn't it? We have searched our own newspaper files and consulted the librarian of the New York *Times*, and found no dispatch mentioning the incident. To our minds the situation revealed in our correspondent's story is one which should cause concern to all decent Americans. It boils down to this. The American Ambassador connived with the British Prime Minister to impede the efforts of Mr. Rublee and the Intergovernmental Committee to deal with the desperate situation of the refugees. When the pogroms finally precipitated a major crisis and multiplied and dramatized the problem, these two officials stepped forward with vague but large solutions and accepted credit for an intention to do something. But their past conduct throws the gravest doubt on their present role. The fate of the refugees should not be left to the reluctant mercies of men who put "appeasement" before humanity. Mr. Kennedy's behavior in London has become a scandal. Isn't this a time when we should have an Ambassador who at least represents the interests of his own people and the desires of the President?

*

THE FEROCIOUS NAZI PROGRAM HAS AT LAST roused the civilized world to face the task of finding a haven for the disinherited Jews of Central Europe. Now, if ever, when public indignation and pity have risen to unprecedented heights, there may be hope of reaching a genuine solution. It has become obvious, at last, that no private agencies can do the job alone. Yet the danger is that, unless strong pressure is continued, the governments, slow-moving as they are, may stop with halfway

THE NATION. Published weekly at 20 Vesey Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter December 13, 1897, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1938, by The Nation, Inc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measures. The President's move to extend permits of refugees in this country on visitors' visas is an excellent gesture, but it is only a gesture. The insistence of the Nazis that the Jews will be allowed to leave only after they have been stripped of every penny increases both the magnitude and the desperation of an already staggering problem. In a later issue we shall discuss the numerous plans so far put forward. Meanwhile popular pressure for a comprehensive solution must be continued and intensified.

*

EXTRACTION OF MONEY UNDER TORTURE and kidnapping for ransom are considered among civilized people the most despicable forms of crime. Yet under Hitler, sadism has become a national virtue and extortion a normal part of treasury procedure. All too clearly the latest pogrom is intimately related to German financial stringency, with the murder of vom Rath serving as a convenient excuse to put into effect measures long prepared. Several months ago Göring ordered all Jews to report their wealth, and the completed data now serve for the assessment of the colossal fine of $400,000,000. In addition the Jewish community is to pay for all the damage done to its property by the Nazi hoodlums, estimated to amount to nearly as much more. Finally the German government is seizing the proceeds of all insurance claims; these, in so far as they are against foreign companies, will provide a useful amount of foreign exchange. This calculation, however, seems likely to turn out badly, as Lloyds of London are reported to have placed all payments in escrow until the policy holders leave Germany. Stolen domestic funds will go a long way toward financing the cost of mobilization during the Czech crisis, which, with national resources already mortgaged to the limit, seems to have been met by inflation. The amount of currency in circulation rose rapidly in August and September and is now more than 40 per cent greater than a year ago. In the field of normal taxation the limit is near, for while national income is little if at all higher than in 1929, taxes are up by 80 per cent. Under these circumstances the Nazi government is likely to extend its gangster methods of financing. The Catholic church is clearly the next in line, with the *Schwarze Korps* already pointing greedily to property controlled by the "corrupt, unpatriotic, and criminal clergy."

*

THREE THOUSAND AMERICANS IN FORTY-SIX states sent telegrams to Dorothy Thompson last week in response to a speech over the radio in which she analyzed the state of mind of the seventeen-year-old Jewish refugee from Germany who shot the Nazi diplomat vom Rath in Paris and involuntarily gave the signal for the robbery, mutilation, and murder of thousands of helpless Jews in Germany. In addition came uncounted letters and several hundred dollars in checks to be used in procuring a fair trial for Herschell Grynzspan. Under a new French decree he may be tried in secret. This is all the more reason why pressure should be exerted in his defense, lest the French government out of fear of Germany dispatch him to the guillotine without a full investigation of the circumstances surrounding his act. The Journalists' Defense Fund, formed to handle contributions, received $1,000 from its first appeal. Limiting its appeal to non-Jews, it has already collected $10,000 and has retained a prominent French lawyer to defend Grynszpan.

*

RETURNS FROM THREE MORE BY-ELECTIONS make it abundantly clear that the British people are not behind Prime Minister Chamberlain in his peace-at-any-price policies. Five constituences have voted thus far in England's "little general election." Three have been carried by the opposition, and the government victories in the other two have been obtained by reduced margins. Most notable has been the victory of Vernon Bartlett, writer on international affairs and stout advocate of collective security, in the rock-ribbed Tory stronghold of Bridgewater. Running as an independent progressive, Mr. Bartlett won by 2,332 votes in a constituency which was carried by the government in 1935 by a majority of 10,569. Mr. Bartlett's triumph carries unusual significance because it was the first for the new non-party coalition which has arisen in opposition to Chamberlain foreign policy. On the previous day John Morgan, straight Labor candidate, won at Doncaster in Yorkshire by 11,708 votes, a gain of 4,000 over the last election. The one Chamberlain victory came in the leather-goods center of Walsall, where Sir George Schuster, a well known banker and economist, triumphed by a slightly reduced margin on the National Liberal ticket. Here the sharpness of the Labor defeat was unexpected, even though Walsall is situated in a non-union industrial area which has traditionally leaned toward the Conservatives. The fact that the latest opposition triumphs came after the postponement of the new Chamberlain-Hitler conversations suggests that more substantial concessions may soon be forthcoming in an effort to check the mounting wave of popular displeasure.

*

SECRETARY HULL'S TRADE AGREEMENTS with Britain and Canada are important, politically and economically. They do not, of course, herald the millennium, nor can they be expected to bring about a large increase in world trade immediately. But they do make the biggest breach yet achieved in the tariff walls which, under American leadership, all countries have built up since the war. They involve a definite modification of the imperial-preference system with which Britain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempted to create a self-contained empire, and they thus open the way to further agreements with the other dominions. Politically they may be considered a force pulling Britain away from the Nazi orbit and a counterweight everywhere to the attractions of autarchy. The exact value of the specific reductions of duties on both sides can only be assessed by experience. In general the long process of horse-trading appears to have resulted in a fair bargain. A greater volume of American than of British exports is favored by lower rates. On the other hand, in making tariff cuts this country appears to have sliced rather more generously than Britain. American machinery and some food products should find better markets in Britain, while British traders have won concessions on textiles and a variety of manufactured specialties. It is not detracting from the merit of the agreements to point out that they will do very little to reduce our surpluses of wheat and cotton. We have still to face the fact that the world market for such staples has gone and will not be restored by any possible trade agreements. This does not mean that we should dismiss Mr. Hull's policies as futile but rather that we must recognize they will not save us from the task of reorganizing agriculture and turning the vast marginal acreage now devoted to cotton and wheat to some more profitable use.

*

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS NOW WASHINGTON'S dominant theme. Brass hats and bureaucrats have gone into a permanent huddle under the benevolent eye of the great quarterback and are discovering military angles to every major problem. Tentative plans have already been developed for utilities and railroads, and now the WPA is being brought into line. We are well on the way to acquiring a cartload of arms, but as *The Nation* has pointed out before, we are forgetting the foreign-policy horse. The President, indeed, touched on this matter a few days ago when he proclaimed the defense of "continental solidarity." That is an impressive phrase, but before we can translate it into terms of armaments we need an answer to such questions as, At what point outside the three-mile limit does defense start? Until we have a definite foreign policy to guide us, the amount and kind of arms we get are likely to be determined, not by real needs but by the degree of heat the different services can turn on the Treasury and Congress. Again there is grave danger in allowing defense to dominate domestic economic policy. It may be easy to slip through some New Deal projects disguised in uniforms, but this kind of smartness can all too easily overreach itself. Let us not forget the grandiose schemes for the regimentation of industry and labor which the War Department has long cherished. We do need an armament plan, duly subordinate to a foreign policy, just as we need an economic plan. There are, no doubt, many points at which the two plans must be harmonized. But harmony will best be secured by keeping the themes distinct, for any attempt to combine them is bound to produce a racket with the military brass predominant.

*

ANTI-TRUST PROSECUTIONS IN THE MILK industry have been due for a long time, and Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold is to be congratulated for his courage and energy in obtaining indictments for price-fixing against sixty-three individuals and thirty-four corporations in the Chicago area. Much will be made—by newspapers which draw calcium from milk-company advertising—of an apparent contradiction between the activity of the Department of Justice and that of the Department of Agriculture, which has issued marketing orders or agreements fixing milk prices in twenty-four urban areas. The contradiction is an unreal one. The fixing of prices by the government, under legal safeguards, is hardly comparable with price-fixing by private combinations, in secret, and without surveillance. The Secretary of Agriculture, after hearings, fixes prices to producers but leaves retail prices to competition. It should hardly be necessary to add that milk combines do not establish prices in order to protect farmers or consumers. Investigations by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Department of Agriculture during the past few years have revealed enormous profits on the part of the great milk companies which dominate the distribution and processing of milk, and most of the established dairy-farm cooperatives as well. The FTC estimated that the average annual return on stockholders' investments in the ten largest dairy corporations from 1929 through 1934 was 10.25 per cent. The farmer is getting too little, the consumer paying too much. Milk is too important a food to be left to the mercies of a few monster corporations. We are more interested than surprised to find that one of those indicted at Chicago is Professor Leland Spencer, milk expert of the New York College of Agriculture. Professor Spencer's methods of analysis aroused criticism in New York in 1934 when an investigation he made for the state showed that the milk companies were practically earning no profits at all.

*

THE SAFE ARRIVAL OF THE ERICA REED AT Barcelona was a dramatic and memorable event. The food ship's cargo, contributed by Americans, not only brought vital relief to those who have suffered so much for values we prize; it was a symbol of that anti-fascist fraternity which neither non-intervention committees nor neutrality laws can wholly disrupt. We are proud that readers of *The Nation* contributed so generously to the ship's cargo. Our rejoicing is tempered only by amazement at the attitude of the Catholic weekly *America* toward the voyage. While the ship was speeding to a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hungry populace facing a desolate winter, *America* was editorially denouncing its sponsors and issuing warnings that the vessel would probably be sunk. This chance apparently upset the editors of that journal, not because it would have meant added suffering for thousands of Spaniards, but because it would have outraged neutral American opinion, thereby jeopardizing the cause of those who would save Spain by starving its inhabitants. *America* dropped the further "confidential" hint that pro-Loyalists were themselves planning surreptitiously to sink the ship, blame Franco, and thus woo American sympathy. This infamous lie is happily scotched by the ship's safe arrival.

✳

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION IS determined to survive even if, as a result, some Americans don't. The newest evidence of this stubbornness is visible in Tampa where the well-being of 25,000 impoverished tobacco workers is threatened by the medical politicians. For years these workers have had the benefit of a cooperative medical program which has drastically reduced the cost of adequate care. Now, at the instigation of the A. M. A. and the American College of Surgeons, the Tampa municipal hospital board has slammed the hospital's doors to physicians identified with the cooperative. Although a court order has momentarily prevented the execution of this ruling, the situation is still precarious; the County Medical Society in that area apparently shares the A. M. A.'s aristocratic precepts and has long kept the physicians serving the cooperative out of the society's ranks. The present attack, typical of the A. M. A.'s last-ditch war on group medicine, is of course camouflaged behind proclamations about "improving medical standards." Its real consequence would be to deprive thousands of workers of decent medical care—workers whose profession renders them peculiarly susceptible to disease—and to penalize an unusually valiant company of doctors.

✳

CHARLES LINDBERGH'S SENSATIONAL flights into international politics continue to agitate the headlines. Did he speak to Lady Astor about the inferiority of the Russian air force, and if he did would the British Foreign Office have taken his word for it? It seems doubtful but. . . . Is he pro-Nazi or merely naive? Why does he persist in his silence? Some would have it that the same pigheadedness that sent him across the Atlantic in 1927 keeps him from offering any defense. Others see him as another T. E. Lawrence with a liking for a reputation as a mystery man and a taste for power. It has even been suggested that when the time comes he may be brought back in triumph to America as the man on horseback (in an airplane) to save the country from the reds and the politicians. The latest is worse than all the others. According to "information from German aviation and American diplomatic quarters" Colonel Lindbergh is contemplating residence in Berlin. The rest is silence, as far as Lindbergh is concerned, and journalistic conjecture. The Associated Press reports that the Colonel's German friends are trying to find a house with a garden for his two small sons, and since the housing shortage is acute it is suggested that he may find what he wants among the Jewish homes that have recently been abandoned! Isn't it time Colonel Lindbergh, if only to keep his father from turning any more in his grave, let the world know what all his recent maneuvers really mean?

✳

THE LONG FIGHT FOR THE FREEDOM OF the Scottsboro boys has met an unexpected and serious reverse. When charges were dropped against four of the boys last year it was confidently expected that pardons for the others would be promptly forthcoming, but Governor Bibb Graves of Alabama has disregarded the overwhelming weight of evidence as well as the urgent pleas of the civilized world. All judicial avenues of relief are apparently exhausted; and while Governor Graves leaves office in January, his successor has thus far indicated no intention to act more humanely. Will Alabama, like California, rob its victims of most of the years of their lives before rectifying a wrong?

Hope and Despair in Europe

THE worldwide reaction against the latest anti-Semitic excesses in Germany indicates that Hitler overrated his Munich triumph. The common people of the democracies have shown a capacity to rise from defeat for a new stand against reaction. Despite censorship and the growing suppression of civil rights, protests have been heard from every quarter of the globe. While President Roosevelt was the only head of a great state to make a public denunciation, he spoke for the common people in all the democracies. In England the silence of the government contrasted with the many expressions of public condemnation of the Nazi terror. In France the rising tide of opposition to Daladier's dictatorial ambitions coincided with displeasure at his indecent flirting with Hitler at the very moment when the attacks against the Jews were at their height. With the extreme right joining the Socialists and Communists in opposition to Reynaud's decrees, Daladier's early fall is not unlikely. Even Poland, noted for anti-Jewish outrages of its own, is reported to be shocked by the extent to which Hitler has carried his attack.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Hitler is more sensitive to world opinion than is commonly believed is shown by his failure to deliver his scheduled harangue at the funeral of Ernst vom Rath. But apart from this one exhibition of restraint, nothing has come out of Germany in the past fortnight which even suggests the possibility of moderation in the Nazi domestic or foreign policy. The campaign against the Jews and Jewish influence on German culture has been carried to more fantastic lengths than ever. New attacks on the Catholics have occurred, and it is evident that this campaign may ultimately reach the extremes which the anti-Semitic drive has attained.

Nor is there any evidence that the coauthors of the Munich pact have in any way been sidetracked in their determination to bring Europe under the domination of fascist policies. In the midst of the flare of indignation against Hitler, both Chamberlain and Daladier completed their long-planned surrender to Mussolini, whitewashing the Italian seizure of Ethiopia and giving the Duce, in effect, a free hand in Spain. Although belligerent rights have not yet been granted to Franco—largely because of the protest of the Soviet representative on the Non-Intervention Committee—an effective and wholly illegal blockade against the Spanish government is being maintained by France and Britain. Last week's disastrous fire in a Barcelona munitions plant makes this action more threatening than ever to Spanish liberties. Moreover, Chamberlain is reported to have given a decisive rebuff to King Carol of Rumania in his effort to gain economic and political support in Britain to offset the new Nazi drive in Central Europe. Although Carol was honored as few visitors have been in England in recent years, he received neither the loan nor the trade concessions which he declared he needed to defend his country against Nazi economic penetration. Much less was he able to obtain promises of aid against the tactics which Hitler used so successfully in Czechoslovakia. Having been turned away empty-handed by Britain, Carol is unlikely to be more successful in France, where grave domestic perils threaten the stability of the government. It would seem that Carol has repeated Benes's mistake of turning to the west rather than to the east for support against Nazi aggression.

In southeastern Czechoslovakia the outlines of Nazi strategy are also gradually being unfolded. The new autonomous Carpatho-Ukraine is apparently to be used as a springboard for a new Ukrainian nationalist movement which, under Nazi domination, will demand "self-determination" for the Ukrainians in Poland, Rumania, and the Soviet Union. With German influence gaining daily throughout Central Europe, and Spain in grave danger, an early overthrow of Chamberlain and Daladier would seem the only hope of preventing Hitler from realizing, well ahead of schedule, the aims set forth in "Mein Kampf."

The Task Before Us

IN A different world one could afford to be a shade complacent about the situation in which the New Deal finds itself after the last elections. A President who has fought on as many fronts as Mr. Roosevelt, made as many enemies, fathered as many legislative novelties, and dared to engage in an attack on the Supreme Court is able to enter the last two years of his second term with a majority in both houses of Congress. His opponents have had to adopt oblique tactics, paying lip-service to his objectives while pretending to differ merely with his methods. Much of his program obviously is here to stay. Under other conditions one could regard even the possibility of a New Deal defeat in 1940 as part of the usual rhythm of progress, one step backward after two steps forward.

This might have been a possible view in 1918. It is not in 1938. There is no prospect now of a new period of capitalist stabilization and expansion during which, without too much danger, we could allow reforms to become atrophied, as they would under a conservative Administration. Measured retreat is impossible in a world in which the propertied classes inevitably turn to a fascist solution of the problems of capitalist decline. The stagnant pools of permanent unemployment must be drained or they will breed the storm troops of a future American Leader. The impact of the axis on our society is inescapable. Its rearmament drive raises the cost of basic raw materials, pushes up our tax bills by forcing us to rearm too, limits the possibility of reform by the necessities of defense and the need of winning and holding allies in business circles, spreads the disintegrating virus of anti-Semitism, and gives weapons to reaction and sets examples for its leaders the world over. Under these circumstances the New Deal must be not merely continued but broadened if democracy in America is to survive.

The recent elections served the useful purpose of a dress rehearsal. The campaign disclosed the obstacles to be overcome, the enemies to be fought. The undertow to the right originated in a middle class surfeited with reform. The small business man, the well-to-do farmer, the better-paid white-collar worker have little appetite for change at any time, and the effects of their terrifying toboggan slide to 1932 and the shock of the bank closings are wearing off. It is true that they operate their businesses and earn their bread under a system which is still ailing, though no longer bedridden. But the drag of unemployment and the minor cyclical fluctuations of the past few years seem to irritate rather than spur to action. Perhaps the chief value of the monopoly investigation is that it may again rouse these groups to a realization of their position.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Growing out of middle-class reaction is a new crop of bigotries, domestic and imported. The appearance of anti-Semitism in several state elections is not unprecedented, for racial and religious issues are not new in American politics; but the combination of unemployment with the victories of fascism abroad and the spread of Nazi propaganda vastly enhance their danger. Linked with the outcropping of Jew-baiting is the increasingly reactionary position taken by most of the Catholic hierarchy, particularly in the East, where Hague and Curley have had the church's unofficial blessing. In both cases the Administration's support of its natural enemies resulted in deserved defeat. The New Deal cannot preserve democracy by making deals with our domestic dictators. As the elections amply proved, this policy weakens or alienates liberal and labor allies whose unified support is essential to continuance of Mr. Roosevelt's reforms. From this point of view third-party proposals of the La Follette or LaGuardia variety, equivocal in their attitude toward reform and questionable in their political flirtations, are a hindrance rather than a help.

The C. I. O. Peace Terms

THE newly established Congress of Industrial Organizations and the old American Federation of Labor will probably achieve "peace in our time," but to set a more precise date for that happy event would be rash indeed. At the Pittsburgh convention which converted the C. I. O. into a permanent constitutional body the "goal of unity in the labor movement" was embodied in a declaration of policy, and no speaker on the issue failed to put in a good word for peace. Nevertheless, unity was not the dominant note, nor was it reasonable to expect that it would be; constitutional conventions are not called until the die of independence is cast. Whatever formal peace comes now must take the form of a pact between two equal and self-governing bodies. This is the only realistic peace there can be between labor organizations whose techniques are so fundamentally at variance, and the events at Pittsburgh were probably an indispensable prelude to such an understanding.

Unable to remain indefinitely in its anomalous position as a disconnected "committee" with something like four million members, the C. I. O. was confronted with two alternatives: it could return to the A. F. of L., retaining some gains in the organization of mass-production workers but with a substantial sacrifice of the principle of industrial unionism which made those gains possible; or it could create an independent labor movement so determined and so promising that it might eventually make peace with the Federation on its own terms or even absorb it altogether. For more than a year the C. I. O. officers dickered with the Green bureaucracy, requesting the status of an autonomous department within the Federation to organize industrially the workers in the mass-production, marine, public-utilities, service, and basic fabricating industries. The A. F. of L. countered with the proposal that C. I. O. unions once affiliated with the Federation be readmitted on the basis of their original charters; other C. I. O. unions, such as the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, for example, would have to meet with all the craft unions of the A. F. of L. that claimed jurisdiction over the employees involved and if possible persuade them to relinquish such jurisdiction. If they refused, that would settle the matter; the steel workers' organization and other C. I. O. giants would then have to allow themselves to be cut up small and distributed bit by bit among the craft unions. The C. I. O. itself was to be dissolved.

However much the delegates in Pittsburgh realized the dangers of prolonged dissension in the labor movement, there was no sentiment whatever for compromise along these lines. Moreover, it was idle to hope that craft leaders would have a sudden change of heart. There is not a shred of evidence that the Freys and the Hutchesons are ready to surrender their claims to masses of workers even though the Federation for a half-century has failed to organize them.

Until the craft lords pull their heads out of the sand and acknowledge the logical interests of the C. I. O., the one hope for solidarity in the labor movement lies in the disposition of the rank and file of both organizations to cooperate, industrially as well as politically, wherever possible. The bitter harangues of some of the C. I. O. leaders at the convention are not going to be helpful in this direction, but despite this far from unnatural residue of passion, there is every sign that the great body of C. I. O. members not only want such practical unity but are getting it. C. I. O. and A. F. of L. worked hand in glove in many places in the recent elections, notably on the West Coast, in Pennsylvania, and in New York, and their cooperation proved both fruitful and instructive. For all the Pecksniffian concern of the press for peace in the labor movement, the present disunity finds labor far stronger than it was before the C. I. O. came on the scene; for the first time a severe economic depression has passed over the country and left its labor movement relatively intact.

Between unity with concessions and uncompromising independence the C. I. O. has made an irrevocable choice. To urge unity with the A. F. of L. now would not bring the two organizations together; it could only encourage disunity within the C. I. O.

[*A first-hand account of the convention at Pittsburgh and an analysis of the present strength and state of mind of the C. I. O. by M. R. Bendiner will appear in* THE NATION *next week.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy and the Jews

BY A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT

London, November 19

AMERICA'S streamlined Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy is now being credited by his friends with helping induce Neville Chamberlain to do something toward alleviating the distress of 700,000 German Jews. But it required sharp prodding, along with Hitler's latest tornado of anti-Semitic terror, to persuade Mr. Kennedy to bestir himself.

George Rublee, director of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, has been endeavoring honestly during the three months he has been occupying that position here, to spur Mr. Kennedy to action. Against heavy odds and meeting one rebuff after another from the thirty-one nations on his committee, Mr. Rublee has been trying not merely to earn the $15,000 yearly salary attached to his new job but to create a sanctuary of decency for Hitler's victims, to whom he represents a last hope. An occasional polite cough from Mr. Rublee, however, scarcely attracted Ambassador Kennedy's notice. And so early in October Mr. Rublee telephoned Washington and prompted the cablegram which President Roosevelt dispatched to Mr. Kennedy for delivery to Mr. Chamberlain.

But Mr. Kennedy apparently did not see eye to eye with the White House in gauging the importance of the refugee tragedy. It may have been symptomatic that the United States Ambassador, now a familiar and welcome visitor at 10 Downing Street, instead of handing the President's message to Mr. Chamberlain and thereby lending personal emphasis to it, simply sent it to the Prime Minister by messenger. This mechanical mode of procedure might in part account for the few noncommittal words with which Mr. Chamberlain replied to Washington. There is yet more conclusive evidence that Mr. Roosevelt and his high-powered ambassador at the Court of St. James's were at variance in estimating the refugee issue as a touchstone of civilization. In his unpublished communication to Mr. Chamberlain, President Roosevelt at some length said he considered solution of the refugees' problem extremely important, not only for simple humanitarian reasons but also for the political appeasement of Europe.

Contrasting with President Roosevelt's opinion were Mr. Kennedy's conversational remarks to Mr. Rublee, in the course of which the Ambassador said he was ready to give the Intergovernmental Committee moral support, but made clear that he was unwilling to endanger other "causes" in which he is interested and which he deems more essential. According to reliable private advices current in London, Mr. Kennedy refrained from identifying the other fish he is intent on frying. Nor did he explain how his more active intervention in behalf of German refugees could have endangered, say, acceptance of the then pending invitation to the British royal couple to visit the United States next summer, or a possible approach to war-debt settlement following a signature of the Anglo-American trade pact. If credit is due Ambassador Kennedy in this connection, it is mainly for his candor in intimating to Mr. Rublee that he declined to regard the plight of Germany's stricken Jews and Gentile refugees as a major interest of the American government and that he quite definitely preferred not to let the refugees cramp his diplomatic style in London. If he kept his sympathy with the refugees well under control, Ambassador Kennedy was at least scrupulously polite, almost too polite, to Mr. Rublee. During the period under review, however, in drawing up the lists of the people chosen to enjoy the lavish and gracious hospitality of the Kennedys' home Mr. Rublee was evidently overlooked; he was not among the guests.

Unleashing of warfare upon German Jews on an unprecedented scale last week, culminating in the summoning from Berlin to Washington of Ambassador Hugh Wilson and President Roosevelt's condemnation of Nazi savagery, seems at last to have goaded Ambassador Kennedy to join those trying to cope with what he had viewed as a relatively minor problem. Fresh instructions from Washington may also have had something to do with Mr. Kennedy's consultation with Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, and Malcolm MacDonald, Minister for Dominions and Colonies. Admittedly, the complete blowing-off of the lid in Germany caused a more resounding detonation than Mr. Rublee's gently admonitory cough. To many, however, it will seem a pity that Mr. Kennedy was apparently prevailed upon to help close the barn door only after the Nazi runaway horse had bolted and left in its path a broad sweep of ruin and anguish.

Of course, there is this to be said for the Ambassador's desire to avoid being too deeply bogged in the ugly refugee mire: Mr. Chamberlain himself has consistently opposed letting the refugees impair an improvement of Anglo-German relations. And Ambassador Kennedy, in his eight and a half months in London, has time and again demonstrated convincingly his slightly grim determination to collaborate with the British Prime Minister.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Continental Defense"

BY PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Washington, November 21

THE President made a fine brave gesture when he voiced his own and this nation's horror over the streamlined barbarism which is supplanting German civilization, but the question remains whether it was more than a gesture. The President sought to point his remarks by proceeding in the next breath to suggest a program of "continental defense," based upon the supposed "solidarity" of twenty-one American republics and the Dominion of Canada. His point was that the American republics and Canada will unite to repel any Nazi attempt to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Alas, there is where the catch comes, and the Nazis are not likely to overlook it. There is very little evidence that such solidarity exists now or that it can be produced in the near future. The only formal basis for concerted action of the kind envisaged by Mr. Roosevelt is the convention signed at Buenos Aires two years ago. It provides:

> In the event that the peace of the American republics is menaced, and in order to coordinate efforts to prevent war, any of the governments . . . shall consult with the other governments of the American republics, which, in such event, shall consult together for the purpose of finding and adopting methods of peaceful cooperation.

What does this mean? It means that if any one of the twenty-one republics, including the United States, deems itself threatened, it can summon the other twenty into a huddle. All are pledged to join the huddle but none is pledged to do anything afterward. In some quarters, indeed, the phrase *"peaceful* cooperation" has been construed to mean the opposite of military cooperation. The fact is that the convention is just another example of the bumbling rhetoric in which statesmen take refuge when they are unable to accomplish anything tangible. I do not say that "hemisphere defense" is an unattainable goal. It is surely conceivable that Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japs will drive the American republics and Canada into a common defense pact. For the present, however, Roosevelt's declaration that our conception of national defense has been exchanged for a conception of hemisphere defense, must be accepted as a conception rather than a reality.

The Argentine Foreign Minister put it rather neatly when he said his country had always "felt" solidarity with other American republics in the matter of defense, but any thought of concluding pacts was out of the question for the present. My guess is that they will continue to "feel" solid—and do nothing about it. Similar pious expressions were uttered throughout Latin America, but among them I was able to discern nothing beyond a feeling on the part of each nation that, if attacked, it would be greatly relieved to have the others come to its assistance. It is in *going* to the assistance of others that the rub occurs. As for Canadian participation, the President's Kingston speech pledging our arms to the Dominion's defense in case of attack was notable for the enormous enthusiasm which it failed to arouse in this country, Canada, or England. The truth is that all such amorous gestures on our part produce lifted eyebrows and a fastidious drawing away. We are a good neighbor and the Canadians like us fine—especially when we show a disposition to stay on our own side of the fence. A system of "hemisphere defense" based on military alliances is obviously impossible, and one illustration will suffice. To become binding on this country they would require the ratification of the Senate, where they would certainly meet the fate which overtook the League Covenant, only much more quickly.

I am loath to accept a partisan Republican argument, but there is a large plausibility in the imputation that the President is confusing political defense with national defense in the present instance. That he intends going in for armament in a big way is quite evident. The need for it is less evident. It is very plain, however, that elements in this country which go into convulsions over expenditures for schools, roads, hospitals, sewers, and public power plants would be very happy if the same sums were laid out for armament. National defense, moreover, is always a sacred cause. The Chicago *Tribune,* which publishes faked photographs of WPA workers under scurrilous captions, would drape American flags around a picture of the same workers digging a gun emplacement. How could General Johnson find it in his heart to criticize any appropriation for mechanizing the army? How could Walter Lippmann or Dorothy Thompson cavil at any measure labeled as a defense against the Nazis? The temptation to spend in the name of "national defense" is a powerful one. Moreover, it has this advantage, that many of the desirable projects now being carried on in the name of social justice could be carried on quite as well, at even greater cost, under a more "patriotic" slogan.

The Administration has just suffered its first great reverse at the polls. Under such circumstances it is natu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ral for Administrations—and it would be singularly characteristic of this one—to resort to a quick change of emphasis. If the voters are a little weary of being indignant about the Stock Exchange, the power trust, and the Liberty League, they probably will welcome an invitation to transfer their indignation to Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japs. And Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japs certainly can be relied on to supply their indignation with plenty of fuel for the next two years. I indulge in this surmise entirely without malice, and, indeed, with a feeling that what I surmise to be true may be all for the best. The truth is, when I contemplate the recent election results in Pennsylvania and Michigan I get a little weary of the voters. They love to be buncoed.

One of the most interesting reports in circulation here is concerned with the Supreme Court. It is said on good authority that *after* the present vacancy has been filled, Justice Brandeis will retire and be succeeded by Felix Frankfurter. Such a succession would have all the perfection of a poem. Professor Frankfurter's qualifications are so obvious that even the American Bar Association concedes them. During the court fight it was reported that Justice Brandeis was nettled over the age issue, but if an inducement to retire were needed, the prospect of being succeeded by Frankfurter would provide it. There remains the question of filling the existing vacancy. I am told the President would dearly love to appoint Frank Murphy, but has been warned the Senate probably would refuse to confirm him. I cannot believe the Senate is quite that bad, but if it is, the President should not shrink from the issue. Serious opposition to Murphy could only arise from his refusal to shoot the sitdown strikers and the fact that he is a Catholic. If those are sufficient grounds for rejection of his name by the Senate, let us know it. The roll call will be public.

Hague's Army Falls Back

BY McALISTER COLEMAN

A VISITING Martian traveling through New Jersey on one of this autumn's golden days would hardly have imagined that so peaceful a scene was in reality a war setting. Even the wastelands of Hudson County back of the Palisades have had a strange, smoky beauty in the sun-flecked haze. Yet for more than a year the state has been harried by wars and rumors of wars, internecine, even interplanetary.

When a group of some twenty men and women went through the empty streets of Jersey City on the dawn of November 20, 1937, to distribute C. I. O. leaflets at the gates of a factory, the struggle between labor and Mayor Hague became a real war. Before that, skirmishes had occurred on picket lines in Jersey City; striking seamen and, later, boot and shoe workers in the big sweatshop rookery that is the Harborside Building had been thrown out of Haguetown into Hoboken; Arthur Garfield Hays, representing the strikers, had kept a lone vigil carrying an American flag on a windswept street by the docks and been hustled out of town—only to seek and obtain an injunction from Judge William Clark, the federal judge who has just recently issued another injunction restraining the Jersey City police. But the C. I. O. was late in starting organization work in Jersey City. Though it was engaged earlier in other parts of the state in defiance of Governor Harold Hoffman (what has become of that bright young man?), it did not undertake the organization of the badly sweated workers in Hague's home town until after election last year.

The first attempt to distribute leaflets in defiance of a local ordinance resulted in the complete rout of what Hague called "the invaders." With great shrieking of sirens and spectacular fury, the police fell upon the distributors, arrested five of them, and pushed the rest into the Hudson Tubes. Then Hague rallied his pay-rollers, his Legion mercenaries, his Catholic and Chamber of Commerce supporters in the first of his surging "American Night" mass-meetings at the Jersey City Armory. There he called for a holy war against the C. I. O., against the defenders of civil liberties, and against all other persons with ideas offensive to the Jersey City dictatorship.

Since that time the opposing forces have clashed on many battle fronts. They have met in Jersey City's Journal Square; in the mean side streets of the grimy town; in Newark's Military Park, where Norman Thomas was egged by Hague's gangsters; in Hague's dependency of Hoboken, where Herman Matson was brutally beaten and then arrested for profanity; in municipal, state, and federal courts. More recently they have met at the polls, where in spite of a thumping Hudson County Democratic vote and the combined blessings of the army, the navy, and Jim Farley, William H. J. Ely, Hague's candidate for the United States Senate, went down to defeat.

As usual, both sides here claim a victory. If we sift the facts from the published communiqués we find that although Hague's iron grip on Hudson County has not yet been broken, the recent injunction granted by Judge Clark restraining the more flagrant restrictions on civil

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberties in Jersey City has hurt Hague in many influential quarters. Pending the final fate of the injunction in the higher court, members of the C. I. O. may walk unmolested through the streets of the city, distribute leaflets urging organization, and even hold outdoor meetings under certain circumstances. It is difficult for an outsider to realize what a concession this is. That the Mayor has been upset by Judge Clark's ruling is indicated clearly enough by the zeal with which his lawyers are pressing their appeal for a stay of the injunction.

Hague is happy over the failure of the federal grand jury to return an indictment against him and his officials for conspiracy to violate the United States civil code upholding civil rights. He is not so happy over the announcement of Welly Hopkins and Henry A. Schweinhaut, special assistant attorney generals, who conducted the investigation, that they would present new and stronger evidence against Hague to another grand jury. In the suit brought by Norman Thomas, who asks for a mandamus forcing Hague to give him a permit to hold outdoor meetings, Hague has won in the lower courts, but an appeal is being taken to the higher court. The case of Herman Matson, who was given a suspended sentence by a scared little Hoboken magistrate, has also been appealed. Now and again rumors reach Hague that investigators from the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee are in town, though lately nothing has been heard from that body. That Hague is becoming distinctly "allergic"—to use the word frequently employed by Judge Clark in his amazing injunction decree—to these libertarian counter-offensives is evidenced by his recent behavior. Never an "easy boss," he is now bellowing at his cowed lieutenants, bawling out his press agents and lawyers.

Mayor Hague

Snarled up as he is in these various legal nets, the sixty-three-year-old boss is most irked by the political situation. From the time he was nineteen, a recent graduate from the leadership of a gang in Jersey City's swarming Hook, his whole active life has been devoted to the manufacture of Democratic majorities. He is one of the last of a generation of indigenous political bosses. If now his creed sounds like a made-in-America version of fascism, it should be remembered that he was running his town in the Tweed-Croker tradition when Mussolini was a jittery editor of *Avanti* and Hitler was painting houses in Austria. Mass hooliganism, political reprisals, and the rest were rampant in our own Jersey City before the word "totalitarianism" ever came from overseas. The technique of oppression of minorities is old stuff for a man who has been able to decide months before election just how many Republican votes were to be allowed in Jersey City.

When the colorless Ely was taken out of his WPA job to run for Senator, Hague kept in the background. The Mayor's first choice was John Milton, who had been sent to Washington as a reward for his faithful services as chief of Hague's legal staff. Milton, however, was needed back home, and it was arranged that Hague was to allow Ely to run on a vague New Deal platform, trusting to the indorsement of the Administration at Washington and the votes of the WPA workers to pull him through. The New Deal gave its indorsement in thoroughgoing fashion. Secretary of War Woodring told a vast Hague-Ely mass-meeting that the President would be "thrilled" to hear how solidly Hudson County stood behind the New Deal. Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison spoke to the same effect, and finally Jim Farley arrived to give the official benediction. Young Ely was so impressed that in a hysterical outburst he turned to Hague sitting behind him on the platform and cried, "He is my leader, my beloved leader." Whatever happened to energize Hague in Ely's behalf, the aging boss showed that his political hand had not lost its cunning. Hudson County turned in a majority of 131,000 for Ely, 2,000 more votes than were cast for Jersey City's favorite son, Governor Moore, in the 1937 election. Although Barbour won by a majority of 108,000, Hague had shown Jersey and the world that in Hudson County at any rate "I decide, me over here."

Nevertheless, Hague's prestige through the state has been sadly diminished. The unpredictable Senator Smathers, who went to Washington with the Hague label but who has occasionally shown signs of independence, may now demand a slice of federal patronage, hitherto securely within Hague's jurisdiction. And there is the perennial threat of a legislative inquiry into the happenings in Hudson County on Election Day. Last year Hague's judges held the line against investigators from Trenton seeking to look into Governor Moore's astounding majorities. Now, however, with fourteen Republicans and seven Democrats in the state Senate and forty-one Republicans and nineteen Democrats in the Assembly, the new Legislature may be more ardent in its pursuit of Democratic skulduggery.

On the whole, politically and legally, the fight seems to be going against the boss, and the stories of his retirement are renewed. After all, he is sixty-three years old, he likes his golf at Miami with Jim Farley and his other pals on the Democratic National Committee, of which he is vice-chairman, and he has been well rewarded for his outstanding services to the big industrialists of the state. Why not quit and take things easy, with no insulting reds around to disturb the twilight of his years? That thought

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be tempting, but it is doubtful if it will lead to Hague's immediate exit. When Judge Clark's injunction, with its puzzling "allergy" references and its heavily documented discussion of the fundamentals of civil liberties, was patiently explained to him, he said, "The fight must go on." He has been told that the C. I. O. is definitely on the toboggan. The withdrawal of the International Ladies' Garments Workers' Union, one of the chief sources of C. I. O. strength in New Jersey, will take away much of their punch from the state's progressive laborites; or so Hague is assured by his loyal A. F. of L. advisers. Furthermore, Hague apparently sincerely believes that he is one of the last bulwarks of old-fashioned Americanism against the tide of red "naturalism."

This menace of "naturalism" may require some explanation for those unacquainted with the vocabulary of Jersey Catholicism. It is a phrase constantly on the eloquent lips of John A. Matthews, who served as Hague's legal and literate front in last summer's injunction proceedings. Perhaps Mr. Matthews himself deserves some explanation. He is a blurredly handsome, florid, gray-haired, enormously articulate Newark lawyer with a lucrative practice, a beautiful radio voice, and an itch to be a judge. Several years ago, during the fight of the consumers of electricity against the exorbitant rates imposed by the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey, which monopolizes gas, electricity, and transportation in the state, Mr. Matthews popped up as defender of the poor. His cross-examination of Thomas N. McCarter, the puffing president of Public Service, put Matthews on the front pages. To his everlasting regret the writer of this article assisted in the publicity build-up. Mr. Matthews then went about the state assuring Catholic organizations that the Labor Encyclical of the Pope contained more fundamentally radical ideas than anything put forth by Socialists or Communists. He was named Papal Chamberlain and Sovereign Knight of the Military Order of Malta, and he became a member of Hague's legal force. During the injunction proceedings he constantly prompted the Mayor while he was on the stand, and in radio speeches he declaimed, "If you, Mr. Thomas, and your ilk want to come to de-Christianize Christianity, the great Catholic masses will ride you out." Now Matthews has discovered that it is the subversive philosophy of "naturalism," as well as Norman Thomas, that is undermining our foundations. Naturalism is not defined other than as being anti-Christ, but Hague is sure that something has to be done about it and that he is the man to do it.

Whatever the extent of Hague's losses in this past year, little has been accomplished in New Jersey to advance the cause of liberalism. The fighting has been done mainly by outsiders—Hays, Morris Ernst, Thomas, and others. Few contests in the recent elections presented so clear-cut an issue as Hagueism, yet the Republicans made little use of it. To be sure, Warren Barbour wrote a letter to Thomas saying that he was in favor of free speech. But he spent most of his time defending himself against the charge that he had claimed exemption from the draft in the World War on the ground that his services were indispensable to the thread business. Veterans of free-speech fights cannot recall meeting Warren Barbour on the front lines. When he was in the Senate before, though he voted for some New Deal measures, his career was as colorless as that of any other run-of-the-mill manufacturer.

Jersey liberals, and there are such, had the choice of two evils and chose the lesser. They voted against Hague to be sure, but they also voted for the Public Service Corporation, the railroads, and the insurance companies, for which Barbour is a front. Many liberals were shocked by the New Deal's indorsement of Hague and stayed away from the polls. After a year of bitter struggle there is no liberal movement in the state worthy of the name.

But after all, the chief cause of war in New Jersey was the attempt of the C. I. O. to organize the unorganized. William Jennings Carney, C. I. O. head in the state, has announced that the Clark injunction means the end of the sweatshop in New Jersey. Now that C. I. O. organizers have freer access to Jersey City workers, we may expect a renewal of the drive, which has seemed strangely hesitant of late. Depending too much upon outside aid, the leaders of the New Jersey C. I. O. have been content to fight the issue in the courts, the papers, and over the radio. They have not taken their fight to the factory gates, the sweatshop doors. To be sure, the atmosphere of Jersey City is still none too salubrious for organizers of any union except the tight-held, Hague-ridden A. F. of L. crafts. But strong unions have been built against greater odds. Even if the Clark injunction is stayed, it is doubtful if Hague will attempt any more mass deportations of organizers at this time. Freedom to distribute literature has been established by the decision of the United States Supreme Court, and some hall-owners may yet be found with courage enough to rent their places for union meetings. It would be difficult to name a spot better suited than Jersey City for an immediate show of C. I. O. strength, but if there is to be a show, it must be put on by New Jersey industrial unionists themselves, not depending on aid from across the river.

Why do reporters of the American scene hasten from New York editorial offices straight across Jersey on their way to supposedly more colorful sources of copy? Why is New Jersey so neglected by the collectors of Americana? Consider the events of this past year: legionnaires in the cellar of a Jersey City armory waiting for the word from City Hall to stage riots as spontaneous as the Nazis' anti-Jewish demonstrations; Hague shouting on the witness stand that he would send all reds to Alaska—he meant Alcatraz but couldn't hear Matthews prompting him; John A. Matthews's personal war on "naturalism"; Jerseymen riding around the country on the night of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Orson Welles broadcast shouting, "The Martians are coming!"; people getting eight cents a day for relief in Hoboken and Matson beaten for protesting; John Longo still in jail for, of all things, election frauds in Jersey City; Jeff Burkitt, thrown out of jail a day ahead of time so that there could be no reception for him, walking the streets of Jersey City with a gag in his mouth. Why go South for the fantastic, the sinister? Only a tube-ride away, my young writing friends, is a copy-mine, full of the richest ore imaginable.

Spain's Schedule of War

BY LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH

Toulouse, France, November

EVER since the Munich "peace" pact, republican Spain has been expecting the worst at the hands of the Chamberlain government—and has been getting it. It anticipated, for instance, that the Anglo-Italian pact would speedily be ratified and that the rebels would no longer be impeded in their attacks upon shipping. All this has happened or is happening. But the Barcelona government, disillusioned and grim, has its own plan of action which in no wise is affected by these developments.

After the Anglo-Italian pact was agreed upon last April but held in abeyance pending "a settlement of the Spanish question," the Negrin government, newly reinforced, followed the policy of frustrating the Chamberlain government by a determined resistance. Culminating in the successful Ebro offensive, this upset all calculations for bringing about a Mediterranean peace on the basis of a Loyalist defeat, and upset Franco's plans for the winter. The Chamberlain government was embarrassed in the eyes of the country—as was expected—although Chamberlain was not. That gentleman is above being embarrassed. The scheduled "settlement of the Spanish question" having thus been prevented, a token settlement was arranged for the purpose of making the agreement effective. Italy made a token withdrawal of volunteers—and immediately began sending back to Spain more war materials and men. It is obvious, and the fact has been long discounted in Barcelona, that Italy has no intention of getting out of Spain until it obtains what it wants, and the Chamberlain government has no notion of crossing its pathway.

It was likewise discounted at Barcelona that this token "settlement" of the Spanish question would be followed by the granting of belligerent rights to Franco and his allies. It is not of record that such rights have been granted as yet, although the sinking in the British Channel on November 2 of the British-register ship, Cantabria, supposedly in the service of the Loyalists, would indicate that there has now been a token recognition of Franco's belligerency. Without belligerent rights Franco could not molest, much less attack, burn, and sink, any ships whatever, whether of the adversary or of foreign governments, outside the Spanish three-mile limit. When in the summer of 1937 such procedure was followed on the Mediterranean, it was rightly called piracy and the Nyon conference stopped it. Now when ships are sunk at England's very door, one hears not even a whisper of protest from England's government.

But since what is happening is only what the Barcelona government expected, that government is pursuing its own course according to schedule. What that course will be was clearly indicated by Prime Minister Juan Negrin's speech of October 14. Its outstanding note was that the *sine qua non* of any settlement of the Spanish question is the driving of the foreigner out of Spain, and that to accomplish this Spaniards of both sides must unite. It was a peace-or-war speech the importance of which has not been sufficiently noted abroad. Spaniards, said Negrin, were prepared to go on fighting even at the price of their own extermination rather than accept an arranged peace incompatible with Spanish honor. "They are no homing pigeons who bring peace to us," he told other countries. Putting his finger on the nub of the policy of the "non-intervention" countries toward Spain, he said: "They affected to ignore what everyone knew [that is, the Italian and German intervention], confident that meanwhile we would succumb and that they could weep over our tomb for our futile heroism and the inclemencies of destiny." And he warned: "Peace will not be achieved by a pretense of stabilizing the fronts and carving out artificial frontiers between rebel and loyalist zones. . . . If any Spaniard admits that, even in hypothesis, he commits the highest treason against the fatherland and strips himself of his own nationality." To the Spaniards who are his adversaries today he offered "a reconciliation . . . upon a basis of collaboration with a view to the reconstruction and the rebirth of Spain." A vision of what might happen was given in the following words: "That is why we must triumph and will triumph. If justice is done to us, then very soon; or, if they continue to create obstacles for us then in months. Or perhaps in years, after a long struggle, in the streets if necessary and at the crossroads, if they attempt to suffocate us."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These statements deserve to be studied as an indication of the government's view of the future trajectory of the conflict. The Prime Minister was giving notice that if driven to it the republican government, rather than give in, was ready to let the conflict revert to the guerrilla fighting that marked the first part of the civil war. "I consider the last statement the most important part of the speech," I was told by a member of the Cabinet. Reflecting the main idea behind the speech, Barcelona is today preparing both for peace and for war.

Barcelona has learned that at Munich Mussolini demanded a continued free hand in Spain and furthermore made the following four demands on Chamberlain: (1) a foothold in the Balearics, if not actual possession of them; (2) guaranties that the political and economic pledges given him by Franco in return for his aid will be fulfilled; (3) the establishment in Spain of a friendly government, which would certainly not be an anti-fascist republic; (4) final settlement of the Mediterranean question. The British government may or may not be disposed to accede to these demands, but it would be well advised to understand that any attempt to do so will not bring peace in Spain except by "suffocation" of the republican government.

Quite apart from specific terms, there still remains the question of the political and economic pledges given to Italy and Germany. How are these powers to be compensated for their heavy expenditures in Spain, made in consideration of those pledges? In the Cortes Negrin emphasized that republican Spain would recognize no obligations incurred toward Italy and Germany by the rebel regime. However, his peace-or-war declaration of October 14 was silent on that subject, and this has been interpreted as leaving a loophole for an arrangement with those countries on the question of compensation. A member of the government informs me that this omission has no significance. Others think that it may have. I believe that opinion in Spain would accept the buying off of the two fascist countries by a monetary arrangement if thereby the invaders could be got out of Spain and the main obstacle to peace be removed.

The Cabinet member mentioned above further informed me: "The words of Negrin relative to welcoming 'mediation between ourselves and the invaders' [as distinguished from mediation between Spaniards] does not mean that Spain is ready either to treat with Germany and Italy or to compensate them for their war expenditures incurred in an effort to destroy us. What it means is that foreign powers, which by their so-called 'non-intervention' have made it possible for the invader to get a foothold on our soil, are free to negotiate with those same invaders in an attempt to get them out if possible. But we will have no foreign mediation between Spaniards of one side and Spaniards of the other."

There is a growing certainty that the government forces in England are once more being made the dupe of Franco's false promises. It is recalled that the rebel leader was constantly using fair words toward England while at the same time helping Italy and Germany along a course that struck directly at England's most vital interests. Franco's recent offer of neutrality toward England in case of war over Czechoslovakia is set down in Barcelona as merely another such snare. "I am confident," said the same Cabinet member, "that Franco was egged on by Italy and Germany to make such an offer in the hope of deluding England and catching it unawares in Spain. By so doing they might have procured a blockade of Spain which would have strangled the republican government, which is a natural ally of England notwithstanding the injuries it has suffered from England's policy. With the Spanish war thus liquidated, Germany and Italy would have been in a stronger position to menace England and France by sea and by land."

In this difficult situation republican Spain is losing no occasion for making conciliatory gestures toward Spaniards on the opposite side. Although semi-public religious worship in chapels has now been the order for some time, the government is determined to establish public worship in churches as soon as possible. Unfortunately the greatest obstacle has been the opposition of the majority of the clergy and their most ardent followers, who are determined at all costs to fix on the Barcelona government the stigma of being anti-God. The Vicar General has in writing forbidden the Basques to hold public worship in churches. On October 17 three Ministers of the government marched in a Catholic funeral procession through the principal streets and boulevards. It was the first time since the war that a surpliced priest and the cross have publicly appeared in a religious ceremony. The gesture was intended to show Catholics on both sides that the republican government is the government of all Spaniards, whether Catholics or dissenters. It was significant that the procession everywhere was received with the utmost respect.

In connection with Negrin's policy of conciliation it may also be noted that the execution of death sentences has for a considerable time been suspended, notwithstanding Franco's brutal refusal to suspend death sentences on a reciprocal basis. About 200 persons are under sentence of death now for treason or similar crimes in various government prisons. I know of one such person who has been transferred to a children's school as a teacher and is no more than a nominal prisoner. It seems clear that the government would like to spare the lives of all these condemned if possible, and in general pursue as humane a policy toward prisoners as is compatible with war. Yet it is not to be doubted that the lives of some of these men will depend on whether peace or war to the bitter end shall be the outcome of Negrin's gestures toward peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The League and the Swastika

BY ROBERT DELL

THE anti-Semitic atrocities in Germany have interrupted for the present the negotiations between Hitler and Neville Chamberlain, but those negotiations will certainly be resumed if Chamberlain has his way. There can be no doubt that the proposed Anglo-German understanding would take the form of a four-power pact into which France and Italy would be admitted as junior partners. It appears, however, to have been recognized by Hitler that some sort of permanent organization is desirable. According to my information, Hitler might even be willing to return to the League if the Covenant were drastically amended, notably by the suppression of Articles 10 and 16. An amendment of the Covenant is, however, a long and difficult business. Some of the amendments to Article 16 and Article 26 adopted by the Assembly in 1921 have not yet come into force because they have not yet received the necessary ratifications. Furthermore, whereas Italy has not yet actually left the League and the Italian notice of withdrawal can be revoked at any time before December, 1939, Germany is actually outside the League and has to be reelected. Germany would certainly not consent to return to the League without having a permanent seat on the Council. A new permanent seat can be created only by a unanimous vote of the members of the Council, and Russia as a permanent member can always veto the creation of a permanent seat for Germany and undoubtedly always would. Thus it will never be possible to get Germany back to the League unless Russia can be forced out. It is precisely for that reason that the Soviet government will probably remain in the League and refuse to be forced out. In these circumstances it is difficult to see how the League can be made safe for fascism, and it would seem that it may have to be scrapped altogether if the Hitler-Chamberlain policy is to succeed.

In any case, Chamberlain has apparently decided to undermine the League from within by a "purge" of the secretariat by which all officials hostile to fascism, or at least all in important posts, would be eliminated. The first step toward this end was taken rather more than a month ago when the Secretary General, M. Avenol, got rid of his own Chef de Cabinet, Marcel Hoden, a Frenchman, by canceling his contract and suppressing his post as from October 31. M. Hoden was dismissed under a staff regulation which empowers the secretary general to cancel a contract of a member of the staff if his post is abolished or if there is a reorganization of the secretariat with a view to the reduction of the staff. Since at present no such reorganization is in progress, M. Avenol had to abolish the post of chef de cabinet.

M. Avenol frankly based his decision on personal and political differences between himself and Hoden and on the allegation that Hoden's conduct had given offense to certain governments, notably the British government, and thereby done injury to the secretariat. Before dismissing Hoden, Avenol paid a visit to Paris, where he saw Georges Bonnet, the French Foreign Secretary, and although the initiative in the matter came from London, the French government no doubt agreed.

The action taken against Hoden is the climax of a press campaign against him and certain other members of the secretariat which began more than a year ago. On June 7, 1937, the Geneva correspondent of the official Italian Stefani agency sent a telegram which appeared the same day in those Italian papers that publish an afternoon edition on Mondays. It accused Hoden and Vigier, a French member of the Political Section of the secretariat, of having inspired a speech made by Fabela, the delegate from Mexico, at a meeting of the Extraordinary Assembly on May 26, 1937, on the question of the credentials of the Abyssinian delegation. The Secretary General immediately appointed a committee presided over by Mr. Lester, Deputy Secretary General, to hold an inquiry. After hearing evidence the committee unanimously reported that the assertion of the Stefani agency was entirely without foundation. Fabela also wrote to the Secretary General to the same effect. Ever since then Hoden has been the object of constant attacks in fascist and pro-fascist papers, notably in the Paris weekly *Candide,* which is the organ of Chiappe, late prefect of the Paris police, and his family.

One of Avenol's accusations against Hoden was that he belonged to a small group who introduced division into the secretariat by pursuing a policy of their own in opposition to that of the Secretary General, and who sometimes opposed their own opinions to those of the delegates of their own governments. This means that they put their loyalty to the League of Nations first in accordance with the declaration that has to be made before the League Council in public session by all officials of the rank of director or above at the time of their appointment. This declaration runs as follows:

> I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions that have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> intrusted to me as ——— of the League of Nations, to discharge my functions and to regulate my conduct with the interests of the League alone in view, and not to seek or receive instructions from any government or other authority external.

It is undoubtedly true that there is a division in the secretariat, but it is between those who live up to this declaration and those who are merely agents of their respective governments, from whom they take their instructions. The latter are so numerous that the secretariat has ceased to be what it was intended to be and at first was—an international civil service.

The countries most responsible for this change are Germany and Italy, especially Germany. The deterioration of the secretariat began after Germany entered the League in 1926. The great majority of the new German officials entirely lacked any international spirit, and the German government looked upon them, and they looked upon themselves, as government officials bound to obey orders from Berlin. This was just as true in the period 1926-33 as it was after Hitler came into power. The Italian Fascist officials were equally subservient to their government, and the bad example of Germany and Italy was followed by some other countries. There are still officials in the secretariat who "seek or receive instructions" from governments and other "authorities external." They belong to various nationalities. It might be thought that if there is to be a "purge," these are the officials that ought to go, not those who put their loyalty to the League first. That is not, however, the opinion of Neville Chamberlain or of the Secretary General of the League of Nations, who is acting on his instructions.

It is apparently intended to get rid of about fifty or sixty members of the secretariat, some of them officials in high positions. It will be done under pretext of economy. On September 30 the Assembly of the League of Nations at its last meeting adopted a resolution authorizing the formation of a committee to make an examination of the budget of the League and recommend ways of providing "necessary economies." In the same resolution the Secretary General and the Director of the International Labor Office were requested "to prepare and draft budgets for 1940 in the light of the recommendations of the committee." This committee has now been set up and will presumably get to work. There is no reason to suppose that a majority of its members, or perhaps even any of its members, have any desire to further the proposed "purge" in the secretariat, but recommendations in themselves reasonable and desirable might be manipulated to effect that purge.

For example, it is quite possible that the committee might recommend the fusion of certain sections of the secretariat. Neither the Disarmament Section nor the Minorities Section has now much to do, and they might be fused with the Political Section. It has already been proposed that the Opium Section and the Social Questions Section should be fused with the Health Section, and that would be quite a reasonable change. Already the Opium and Social Questions Sections have the same director although they have separate members. The fusion of two or three sections into a single section would eliminate one or two of the present directors, and the Secretary General could choose for elimination men obnoxious to the fascist powers.

Since it is, however, likely that it will be a long time before the Committee on Economies in the Budget produces a report, the instigators of the "purge" may prefer a more rapid procedure which would also make it much easier to get rid of the anti-fascist officials. The last Assembly arrived at the following decision:

> Until the next ordinary session of the Assembly the Secretary General and, as regards the International Labor Organization, the Director of the International Labor Office, acting with the approval of the Supervisory Commission, which may take all decisions by a majority vote, shall have power in their discretion to take any exceptional administrative or financial measures or decisions which appear necessary (including the amendment of administrative or financial regulations), and such measures and decisions shall have the same force and effect as if they had been taken by the Assembly.

It was, however, provided that this should be brought into force only by a decision of the President of the Nineteenth Session of the Assembly (that is, the session held in September) if and when in his opinion a state of emergency had arisen. As the last session was not closed but only adjourned, the Assembly is still in being, and its President is Mr. De Valera. It rests with him, therefore, to decide whether these exceptional powers shall be given to the Secretary General and the Director of the International Labor Office. A literal interpretation of the Assembly resolution might justify Mr. De Valera in deciding that a "state of emergency" has arisen, but such a decision would certainly not be in accordance with the wishes of the Assembly. The resolutions were adopted merely to provide for the possibility of war breaking out before next September, and it was clearly explained at the time that a "state of emergency" really meant a state of war. De Valera has fascist sympathies, as his words and actions at Geneva have shown. If he declared a state of emergency, the Secretary General could do almost anything he liked, subject to the approval of the majority of the Supervisory Commission, which deals with the finances of the League.

It will be much more difficult to deal with the International Labor Office. Nobody believes for a moment that the new director, John P. Winant, would allow himself to become the instrument of those who wish to make the League of Nations safe for fascism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberal's Defeat—a Case History

BY JOHN E. KENNEDY

Hamilton, Montana, November 18

PROBABLY in no other state is the domination of one corporation so outstanding as in Montana. The great Anaconda Copper Mining Company, owning as it does all but two of the daily newspapers in Montana, and controlling by advertising or credit the majority of the weekly papers, can mold public opinion to an alarming extent. This was made painfully clear to progressives in Montana by Tuesday's election, when Representative Jerry J. O'Connell, liberal New Dealer, was defeated by the copper-power-newspaper combine, aided by Senator Burton K. Wheeler and Governor Roy A. Ayers.

Senator Wheeler, who since the Supreme Court fight has become the darling of the copper and power interests in Montana, gave the word that O'Connell must go. The state machine of the Democratic Governor, Roy E. Ayers, came to the Senator's help, and a campaign was started for Dr. Jacob Thorkelson, Republican and Anaconda Company nominee, the like of which had never been witnessed in Montana. As a result a political nonentity was built up to the stature of a United States Congressman in six weeks.

Day in and day out the company press denounced O'Connell and praised Thorkelson. Senator Wheeler induced Dr. Francis E. Townsend to withdraw his indorsement of O'Connell and later to come to Montana and make an address against the Congressman. Although Townsend spoke to 600 persons in Helena, and made a district-wide radio address in addition, his appearance was something of a flop. More than 175 persons walked out of the hall in a body when he started his attack upon O'Connell. Even after his visit, the majority of the Townsend Clubs in western Montana passed resolutions indorsing O'Connell's candidacy.

When it was apparent that this strategy would not work, Senator Wheeler similarly induced several of the rail brotherhoods to withdraw their indorsement of O'Connell. An edition of *Labor* condemning O'Connell and praising Thorkelson went to its regular Montana subscribers, and in addition thousands and thousands of copies were sent into the district for door-to-door distribution in Missoula, Kalispell, Whitefish, Helena, Butte, Anaconda, and Bozeman. This distribution was handled by the Anaconda Company.

Over various radio stations in western Montana a statement was read purporting to come from James A. Farley, to the effect that Mr. Farley had urged Montana Democrats to get together and had severely criticized O'Connell for his attacks on Senator Wheeler. In due course, the Postmaster General denied that he had made such a statement, but it was then too late to remedy the harm which had been done O'Connell's candidacy. When this matter was checked, it was discovered that the news dispatch in question had been forwarded to Montana radio stations by Ed Craney of radio station KGIR of Butte. Craney sent other stations the statement as having come from the Transradio Press and added the revealing note, "Senator Wheeler would appreciate any additional publicity you are able to give this announcement."

The Catholic hierarchy opposed O'Connell in every nook and corner of his district, and the copper-power-company crowd, who control both the Catholic and non-Catholic groups, got the word to Masonic groups that as a member of the state legislature O'Connell had led the fight for the free-textbook bill, which would have permitted children in parochial schools to obtain books on the same basis as students in public schools.

With the Democratic State Central Committee controlled by Senator B. K. Wheeler and the Corporation through the chairmanship of Arthur F. Lamey, a railroad and utility lawyer of Havre, it was clear to O'Connell at the outset that he would receive no financial contributions from the State Committee. Lamey was frank to say these were the instructions he had received from higher up. The Democratic National Committee likewise made no financial contribution to the O'Connell campaign and the Democratic Congressional Committee sent its regrets at not being able to help.

William Green's refusal to indorse O'Connell and request for Thorkelson's election did little harm. As a matter of fact, the *Montana Labor News,* the A. F. of L. organ for Montana, urged O'Connell's reelection. It was, however, a sad blow that John L. Lewis of the C. I. O. failed to indorse him. Miners and smelter workers in Butte and Anaconda were asking each other during the campaign why, if the Congressman was a friend of labor, John L. Lewis didn't offer his support.

A. F. of L. unions in Helena passed resolutions condemning Green's action and indorsing O'Connell. On Saturday, November 5, they presented a paid advertisement to the *Independent* and the *Montana Record Herald* in Helena, both dominated by Anaconda, urging union labor to stick with O'Connell. Both newspapers refused to accept the advertisement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Communist bugaboo was played up in every way, reaching its climax in the last week of the campaign when Thorkelson's company supporters brought out a placard with a picture of Uncle Sam at the top, Thorkelson at the bottom, and in bold type the words "Crush Communism." In the last two days of the campaign handbills were circulated all over Montana claiming that the fact that Roosevelt had not mentioned O'Connell in his last radio address was conclusive evidence that the President was against him.

O'Connell fought his campaign without any organization, with inadequate finances, with no help from the State Committee or the National Committee, and with the powerful copper-power-Wheeler-Ayers machine against him. He had to depend upon his own platform speaking and the support of three weekly papers, the *Western News* of Hamilton, the Columbia Falls *Review*, and the *Montana Labor News* of Butte. While Senator Wheeler spoke in practically all of the small towns in the district urging Democrats to vote against O'Connell, Mrs. Wheeler and Rose Bresnahan, dismissed director of the Women's Division of the WPA in Montana, visited all WPA sewing projects urging support of the Republican nominee. The Senator, a former ardent dry, even went so far as to visit Montana bars and buy drinks while urging the defeat of O'Connell.

Pocket Guide

THE PRESS-AGENT RACKET

JUST now big business is obsessed with "the great coming new profession," that of public-relations counsel—the press agent in modern dress. He has been with us for some time but he has recently come into a new prosperity.

There is no other business quite like his. He makes his terms with his customer on a completely up-in-the-air basis. He cannot promise to deliver anything specific, and after the job is done he can't prove what he has accomplished by sales figures. He waves clippings to show how much newspaper space he has obtained free—but whether it has sold the client's goods is something else again. And the amazing thing is that business doesn't try to find out what it is getting for its money, whether the press agent is earning his pay or is merely exploiting a rich racket.

What is the justification for these public-relations counsels? Who are they? How do they work? What do they accomplish? What are their profits?

Scared by the FTC, the Food and Drug Administration, and consumer movements, the manufacturer is hysterically trying to put on a better face before the public. And since the public is learning to distrust his advertising, he tries to put across his story in some other way. He ought to know that the best public-relations copy is the goods he is selling. Often, instead of trying to sell better goods, he tries to sell words, and the public-relations counsel provides them.

Who are they? Among the bigger public-relations counsels are Carl Byoir (chain stores), Ivy Lee (Standard Oil, Pennsylvania Railroad), Edward Bernays (beer), Braun and Company of Los Angeles ("Beat Upton Sinclair," chain stores), Ralph H. Jones (Little Steel), Ames and Norr. But a new one starts up every week. No capital is needed, and for many of them reputation would be a drawback. They do need nerve, and most of them have it, including the one who proposed to wash all the statues in the United States with Colgate's Soap. Colgate's said no. The War Department said no. But the p.r.c. released a story all the same, saying that the War Department didn't want its statues to be cleaned although a soap company had offered to do the job for nothing. In addition to the foregoing, all the big advertising agencies now do big-time public-relations work, handled by what they call the "publicity department."

How do the general run of public-relations counsels work? They have employees ready to grind out routine stuff, but suppose they are asked for an article glorifying canned goods. They get a chemist of standing to write a piece for a big magazine which will be read by unsuspicious readers who have no idea that it is press-agent stuff. The manufacturer then makes quotations and sends them out to newspapers.

They send mountains of material to the schools, and they work overtime on the radio. They dispatch speakers to schools, to colleges, to women's clubs, to organizations of business men. Of course they work on Congress and legislatures. If existing magazines and organizations aren't enough, they start their own with fine names and loud protestations about protecting the consumer. All over the country are fake consumer organizations which are merely fronts for various industries.

If they can't buy the writer they want, they use other methods. For example: One of the biggest press agents in the country—let us call him Mr. Brass—wanted a biography written of a client, Mr. Money. He got in touch with a writer, Mr. Pen. Pen said he'd like to do the job if he could get all Mr. Money's fresh and untouched material. "Fine," said Brass, adding, "Of course we can't finance your writing the book." "I wouldn't want you to," said Pen. "But before you give me the material you must understand this—I'm a radical, and I shall write the book from that point of view." Brass replied shrewdly, "Fine; we want you to write it just because you are a radical."

Pen was puzzled. But a telephone call the next week cast a little light. Said Brass: "We have a little job of 5,000 words, a circular for the X and Y Railroad. We'll pay you $5,000 for it." Pen, amused at the barefaced use of the biography as a bribe, said he was sorry, but he was too busy.

A week later Brass called up again. This time there was a month's work to be done for a political candidate in Chicago. It was very difficult work; only Pen could do it right; the job was worth $10,000. Pen, who badly needed the $10,000, again felt that he had to refuse. Sequel? The material on the great man was never turned over, and the biography was never written.

There are also the simple, old-fashioned methods. Every public-relations counsel, no matter how elegant, has at least one ex-reporter on his staff. The ideal one is a drinker, a wisecracker, who goes out every night for cocktails with an old buddy on a newspaper. Later he telephones the buddy,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I got a little story for you." With the story goes a bottle of Scotch, or prize-fight tickets. And usually someone on the staff can play the social game which was long ago brought to perfection by British duchesses.

What do they accomplish? Don Francisco, president of Lord and Thomas, has boasted that public-relations work defeated Upton Sinclair and caused the repeal of the chain-store tax bill of California. Public-relations work had much to do with defeating Governor Benson in Minnesota and Governor Murphy in Michigan. But one of the biggest campaigns ever handled, that for the public utilities, couldn't stop the TVA, nor did U. S. Steel's drive against unionization in 1936 work out. At the moment Carl Byoir, who has represented Machado of Cuba and the Nazi government, is doing a job for the A. and P. Company. Women are certainly not going to read his dreary spreads of small type, but the A. and P. in public relations is a novelty, and Mr. Byoir is pulling in customers for himself with great speed. It is a good p.r. job for him whatever it may be for the A. and P.

If industry is being fooled, what about the newspapers and magazines? Every penny paid to a press agent would normally go into paid advertising. Yet newspapers and magazines hand over the free space. Why? Of course the advertiser applies quiet pressure. He doesn't go to the newspapers and say, "Here's a lot of advertising; now you give us plenty of free space." That would be crude. But his wants are understood. However, there's more to it than that. I can say from my own knowledge that many newspapers are as bamboozled by this pie-in-the-sky public-relations business as the simplest-minded manufacturer. It's fantastic, for the press agent means death to newspapers and magazines, which live on advertising. If the public-relations technique works, less advertising space will be taken and perhaps even none.

As in every other field there are good and bad press agents. Many decent business firms and many non-business organizations use them. But they're handicapped. They don't have a drunken ex-reporter on the staff, and they can't work the racket fully. In general, a press-agent job must pretend that it is something it isn't; it is writing over a false name, speaking with a false voice. Compared with the press-agent industry, advertising, bad as it is, shines with honesty and directness.

HELEN WOODWARD

In the Wind

THE PRESENT Hitler terror has underscored a journalistic boner committed by the Hearst papers last month. When the demonstrations against Cardinal Innitzer flared up in Vienna, all news accounts except those in the Hearst press blamed the Nazis; the Hearst papers in headlines and stories played up charges that "Communists" had instigated the riot, attributing these statements to "Nazi officials." This position was taken because William Randolph Hearst, in a memorandum to his executives from San Simeon, had expressed the "belief" that Communists were responsible. Now, with Hitler spokesmen publicly taking credit for the terror, Hearst is writing front-page editorials denouncing the "Nazi outrages."

THE FRANCO regime recently ordered the withdrawal of an entire issue of 25-centésimo nickel coins. Though they had been issued by the Franco government, they were retired because a minute hammer and sickle was found engraved on them. The coins were made in Germany.

ON THE eve of the Munich agreement the London correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune* cabled a dramatic account of the debate in Parliament. One sentence in his dispatch read: "Big Ben was slowly ticking peace away." Either because of transmission difficulties or editing on the cable desk in New York, the sentence appeared in print as "Big men were slowly kicking peace away."

AMONG WIDESPREAD public protests against the German anti-Jewish drive the utterances of Alfred E. Smith have been prominently featured. It is not generally known, however, that at the height of the recent New York campaign, when anti-Semitic feeling was being widely used against Governor Lehman's candidacy, Democratic chieftains pleaded with Smith to condemn publicly the introduction of the religious issue. Smith refused.

IN WESTMINSTER County Court, London, a witness told Judge Dumas that his name was Neville Chamberlain. "Is your name really Neville Chamberlain?" asked the Judge incredulously. "Unfortunately, yes," was the witness's reply, for which the Judge promptly rebuked him.

ON LAST JULY 7 Reuter's (British news agency) dispatched this cable from Tsingtao to its Shanghai office: "Briton Jock Crichton stopped by Japanese sentry for smoking cigarette Commercial Wharf this morning. Crichton extinguished cigarette and apologized, *whereupon sentry slapped his face.*" The Shanghai office received the cable from Tsingtao in the following form: "Briton Jock Crichton stopped by Japanese sentry for smoking cigarette Commercial Wharf this morning. Crichton extinguished cigarette and apologized, *whereupon sentry let him go.*"

FOLLOWING UP the campaign reported in this column some months ago, the National Association of Manufacturers is directing another barrage on school officials to persuade them to accept the association's "You and Industry" booklets for classroom use. The booklets are distributed free. The N. A. M. claims that they are being used in 1,500 schools.

AN ARTICLE in *Contemporary Japan* for March, 1938, describes relief measures for soldiers' families as follows:

> Our imperial family always has accorded unlimited consideration to the people. Their Majesties, the Emperor and the Empress, have granted money for funerals of those killed in battles. Particularly, Her Majesty the Empress has graciously given cakes impressed with the imperial crest as offerings to officers, soldiers, and policemen who died from wounds or illness in the incident; and she has also composed a poem consoling their spirits.

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THERE is but one subject I can discuss in this issue, and that is the Nazi barbarism in Germany. Indeed, I feel that it is the one subject that Americans should be discussing everywhere, for it is the most intolerable wickedness that any living man or woman has ever witnessed. No, I am not forgetting Ethiopia or the horrors in China, which were or are so vast as to preclude the human mind's grasping them in full. When millions are killed, the brain fails to comprehend. But at least in those two countries there was a war, and a stupid humanity still recognizes war as a legal means of settling disputes between human beings. Nothing, however, in any war has exceeded the deliberate, cold-blooded robbery, degradation, and torture of the Jews of Germany by the Nazis, using the crime of a half-crazed seventeen-year-old boy as their excuse. Not men nor women nor children have been spared by the fiends who boast of their manliness, their Aryan purity, their divinely appointed mission to lead the world to a "higher civilization."

We now know exactly what these men were about. The policy of the infamous Jew-baiter, Streicher, has been brought into the open and adopted as that of Goebbels, Göring, and Hitler. They have published their program. It is the *deliberate murder* of fully 600,000 people by slow starvation, after they have been robbed of all their possessions, after they have been deprived of education and of every means of support, forbidden to remain in trade, denied the right to be peddlers, denied the right to a work card, without which no German can obtain a laborer's job, and today even denied, in Munich and other cities, the chance to buy food except as kind-hearted shopkeepers—so reliable press dispatches report—sell it to them surreptitiously after dark. On top of this the ghetto is to be revived, into which the Jews are to be crowded without means of livelihood, to die by inches of mental and physical starvation.

Doubtless no foreigner and no kind-hearted German will be allowed to enter the ghetto to reveal to the world the horrors within. Already 300 Germans are under arrest for protesting against this unbearable crime against all humanity. And not one word of the protests of the horrified world is permitted to appear in the German press; the recall of Ambassador Wilson will doubtless be portrayed as a mere routine return to the United States for vacation purposes. With calculated fiendishness the bloody-handed masters of a once proud Germany which boasted of its superior *Kultur* are going to blot out some of the finest, most brilliant, most loyal and devoted souls Germany has ever produced, counting upon the world to stand by and let them get away with mass-murder, precisely as England and France assented to the destruction of Czechoslovakia, and the League of Nations finally yielded to the despoiler of Abyssinia.

It was time for President Roosevelt to act, and I rejoice with all my heart that he has reinforced the camouflaged recall of Ambassador Wilson by still more vigorous action. The words that he has so bravely spoken have been welcomed by every decent and loyal American. He spoke for the conscience not only of America but of the world. If he had not done so he would have been recreant to the finest American traditions. Not our business? Never was anything more so. Historically it has always been our business to rise in protest against such horrible atrocities, in Russia, or Armenia, or Africa. Of course it is our business when we, with the rest of the world, are called upon to take care of the refugees.

What would I do now if I were President? I should send for the German ambassador and express without reserve the outraged feelings of America. Then I should send for the Russian, French, and British ambassadors, repeat to them what I had said to the German, and ask the moral cooperation of their governments in a joint protest. Next I should publicly send for Senator King and discuss with him his proposal to break off relations with Germany, and then ask other leaders to see me and discuss the same question. Far more important than that, I should raise the embargo against Spain and enforce the neutrality law against Japan, and so let the world know that without the slightest thought of resorting to war, I was mobilizing the moral opinion of the world under the leadership of the unconquerable moral power of America. I should ask Congress to rescind its action in voting $3,000,000 for an utterly unnecessary Jefferson memorial in Washington and to vote that amount for a permanent fund for aiding the refugees from European tyranny. Idle gestures? Well, I can't believe it when I read the furious attacks of Hitler upon Duff Cooper, Winston Churchill, and Anthony Eden, who have dared to attack him and to oppose the policies of Hitler's ally, Neville Chamberlain. If these criticisms had not gone deep under Hitler's skin, he never would have had the effrontery to tell the English people whom they should and should not elect to office. Peace in Europe? That is impossible now. Peace with Hitler will never be possible, no matter how many mutual-security pacts are signed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Bombs and Philosophy

PHILOSOPHER'S HOLIDAY. By Irwin Edman. The Viking Press. $2.75.

MR. EDMAN'S book bears an unpretentious title, but in the period after catastrophe has changed our world it may become a historical document. It is the record of the observations, experiences, preoccupations, aesthetic, intellectual, and social, of a man of liberal culture, such as a Roman gentleman of Gaul might have written in the fourth century, when the afterglow of a sunlit day was giving way to a melancholy and threatening twilight. Mr. Edman's sense of precious things is sharpened by intimations of their impending loss, but his mood is none the less cheerful, as befits a holiday. He has accepted the dogma of Heraclitus in the spirit of Democritus. He realizes Matthew Arnold's aspiration, to be "gay without frivolity."

The miscellaneous nature of the volume permits Mr. Edman to include memories of New York in his childhood, of his own early misgivings in a world not realized, of his teachers and former pupils, of travel and the casual associations that it brings, of aesthetic experience in nature, music, and the noble architecture of Greece. All these are recalled with gusto, if one forgets the boisterous suggestion that Hazlitt threw about the word, and reported with an engaging frankness which invites intimacy and a feeling of participation.

This urbane approach to human things lures the reader into sympathy with Mr. Edman's philosophy and its application to the present state of the world. He quotes William James: "A professor of philosophy studies philosophy. A philosopher studies life." It is in this holiday that Mr. Edman become a true philosopher; and whatever may be his philosophic creed in the classroom, in his private hours of ease he is a pragmatist. He went to college in the days when William James and John Dewey were in the ascendant. We catch their echoes in the declaration: "However life be defined it is something immediately sensed and felt and known." For a later influence he shares Santayana's reliance on animal faith, and enters his "realm of essence." Philosophy is for Mr. Edman a genuine guide to life, and in its stimulation of interest and ardor it becomes, as he suggests, assimilated to poetry.

The serious interest of Mr. Edman's book lies in its comment on the intellectual world that he has known. He has seen the "climate of opinion" change frequently and violently in response to "winds of doctrine" blowing from many quarters. "A sociological study might be made," he remarks, "of the time lag between the discovery of ideas and their popular or snob appeal. Along with my contemporaries I have lived through many fashions in ideas: Dewey, Bergson, Freud, Marx, Einstein, T. S. Eliot, liberalism, progressive education, fascism, communism, neo-Thomism, progress, disillusion, reform, revolution." To a philosopher the most sinister change in "psychological climate," to use Balfour's term, is the reaction against belief in the control of human affairs by intelligence and reason. In the years immediately before the World War liberalism was in fashion. Education had a good start in its race with catastrophe. Science was to prove a new Messiah, cradled in the laboratory. Social psychology had been discovered. "Theology itself became a gospel of social reform." Mr. Edman sees clearly how shallow were the roots of this liberalism, how largely it was an affair of words, how the popular breath poisoned the atmosphere in which ideas tried to live. But the repudiation of the mind, the replacement of cerebration by blood thinking, must remain for the philosopher the supreme tragedy.

It is in his last chapter, The Bomb and the Ivory Tower, that Mr. Edman's philosophy is put to its final test. "Ever since I can remember thinking and feeling about the world at all," he writes, "I have been torn between the conception of the world all threats, alarms, and obligations, and the vision of it as an arcanum of delighted perception, a spectacle to be enjoyed, endured, and understood." He admits the overwhelming sense of obligation in a world in which women and children are being bombed in Spain and China, in which families are starving in our own South, in which refugees by the thousand are fleeing from the wrath that is, only to be engulfed by the wrath to come. "One basks in the sun, one listens to music, one has friends, one broods, one wonders, and occasionally one is lighted with a gleam of understanding. . . . But in a society where the bombs batter against the mood of felicity, art and philosophy must, for the most part, be moral holidays." Mr. Edman, however, stoutly maintains the right of the philosopher to his holiday, the only time when he becomes really himself. "It is his task . . . to commit himself as to what is the good life," and the good life can shape itself according to his desires only in that freedom of intercourse and contemplation of which Mr. Edman has given explicit illustrations.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

Rise or Fall?

THE RISE OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION. By Charles Seignobos. Translated from the French by Catherine Alison Phillips. Alfred A. Knopf. $4.50.

THIS admirable piece of work has the qualities of a mathematical treatise or a very formal symphony or architectural construction; it is pure historical art. For that reason it will not be easy for the general public to read, and while the translation deserves great praise, the fact that this volume is the result of translation is unlikely to increase its popular appeal.

"Unity began to come into being toward the opening of our era among one portion only of the populations of Europe, and assumed two forms: unity of civilization, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work of the Greeks, and unity of government, the work of the Romans." It is in this manner that Professor Seignobos can, in a sentence, indicate the entire history of ancient Europe. And yet one understands why architecture perhaps too readily allies itself with decorative sculpture.

Professor Seignobos clears away whole thickets of inaccurate slogans which have been allowed to entangle the path of the lay student of history, at least until recently. He points out that "the arts had been producing beautiful works since the twelfth century and had no need to be reborn. The men of the Middle Ages had not ceased to admire the writers of antiquity." The so-called Renaissance, therefore, was rather a period of the rapid development of technique. It is only, perhaps, when Professor Seignobos tells us that all the original works of eighteenth-century literature are in prose that the lovers of Alexander Pope themselves will be forced to cry out against the exactness of a sentence whose merits they will otherwise appreciate. They will, of course, delight in Professor Seignobos's analysis of the French Revolution of 1789: "The Revolution had produced results very different from what its authors had intended. . . . They had desired to reform the monarchy, and had established a republic; to restore the finances, and had ended in a deficit and bankruptcy; to reorganize the church, and had overthrown it. . . . They had wanted to renounce war and conquest, and had involved France in a general war followed by extensive conquests." It is not only in the twentieth century that man too often seems to destroy precisely that which he had wished to fortify.

Professor Seignobos is of course well aware that Hitlerist notions were rife in Germany long before 1914. In writing of Germany after 1870 he points out that nationalism there was "consolidated into a pseudo-scientific doctrine based upon a confusion between race and language." Nor does he suffer from the illusion that political principles can prevail when they are not backed by a certain degree of force. It is perhaps for this reason that he retains the optimistic title he has chosen for this book, with the implication that European civilization is still in the ascendant, for he brings his narrative up to the immediate present. It is clear that Professor Seignobos condemns the anti-democratic systems of today. "In lands where political experience was insufficient," he writes, "the catastrophe resulting from the war has led to a retrograde movement toward a system based upon compulsion." But he does not seem to fear that this retrograde movement may become general and may indeed be related to the stage we have reached in mechanical progress. The organization of civilized life he attributes to "analogous methods . . . arising out of conditions common to all peoples and, still more, from imitation of the same innovations, made as the result of exceptional conditions . . ."; such phenomena might today be leading, in Europe, to civilization's decline and fall.

Professor Seignobos's description of arbitrary government in the police state of the eighteenth century gives but a pale though exact reflection of the brutal tyranny exerted by contemporary dictators. Unlike Renaissance monarchs, they have discarded those "externals of Italian politeness" which characterized the earlier pupils of Machiavelli. And their states are inspired by what Professor Seignobos defines as "instinctive repulsion for the foreigner," in the place of those humanitarian ideas which somehow pervaded the absolutist states of the Age of Reason.

ELIZABETH WISKEMANN

Portrait of Lillian Wald

LILLIAN WALD, NEIGHBOR AND CRUSADER. By R. L. Duffus. The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

SOCIAL settlements are alike in providing certain fundamental services. But all have special functions and characters which grew out of the circumstances of their founding and the personalities of their founders. Henry Street Settlement was not deliberately founded at all. This is one of its many distinctions. When Lillian Wald and Mary Brewster went to live on the East Side in 1893 they had never heard of a settlement. They were trained nurses, and their whole intention was to nurse those who needed nursing and couldn't afford to pay for it. They had hardly begun when they discovered that their work involved much more than nursing. It involved family health, domestic and public sanitation, food, clothing, housing, employment, conditions of work, wages, schooling, vocational guidance and recreation; problems of personal, economic, and social adjustment; interpretation, advice, and protection to an alien, poverty-stricken, and exploited population; investigations, surveys, records, and civic campaigns. If the settlements were in those years "the spearpoints of reform" as Mr. Duffus says, it is easy to see that they had to be. Their intensive and extensive growth was a demonstration of the interrelatedness of all social problems. "All that we ever did we did the first day," says Miss Wald. ". . . We were pushed into everything we did. . . . It was not a plan but a compulsion."

But this is not the story of the settlement and the nursing service but of their founder and head worker. She had to withdraw from active service a few years ago, but her work goes marching on. And this work is impressive in its social vision, scope, and spreading practical achievement. Lillian Wald is best known as the initiator of public-health nursing, which has spread from New York's East Side all over the world, but actually she was a pioneer in many fields and was in the thick of every liberal movement. The Children's Bureau was conceived by Lillian Wald and Florence Kelley, and both were among the most active campaigners for its establishment. Miss Wald, in fact, was referred to as "the woman behind the bureau" and might have been its first head if she could have borne to leave her own work. Every organized movement to help children had her active support, as well as trade unionism, woman suffrage, and the peace movement as represented by the American Union against Militarism, which did its best to "keep us out of war." A league of neutrals and an anticipation of the "cash-and-carry" plan of 1937, intended to keep us out of another world war, were among the plans urged on President Wilson by the union.

But Mr. Duffus has given us a portrait of a personality as well as the story of a career. There is an ingenuous charm in the manner of Miss Wald's entrance upon the life work that was to make her a distinguished citizen. Nobody ever

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pioneered with less fuss, self-consciousness, or self-importance. She came from a happy, cultivated, well-to-do middle-class home, and the concept of a kindly cooperative family life underlay the settlement organization and made it markedly uninstitutional. She had exceptional parents, for if it was unusual for a girl of her generation and milieu to wish to be a nurse, it was even more so for the parents to offer no objections. She started her social work with no theories and no sense of being remarkable or sacrificial. She wanted to do her duty as a citizen, as she said in her first simple statement of her nursing plan, and to make known the terrible conditions she encountered. She thought people could not know about them. If they did they would want to change them. She loved work and she loved people; she had great practical ability, a genius for organization, a feminine passion for bringing about order and happiness. Incapable of condescension, naturally democratic, she had a "way" that made her both generally beloved and obeyed, a talent for friendship and instinctive knowledge of how to appeal to the right people or agencies to get things done.

Apart from the endless claims upon her at the settlement she worked on committees, wrote reports, articles, and books, addressed legislatures, appealed to Presidents, and worked with various official boards whose work she had often anticipated or supplemented. When she writes or speaks, she is always appealing and authoritative, never either theoretic or sentimental. Jacob Riis once described her as weeping over a patient while deftly dressing a wound. She never did, she assured her biographer, who would have known it anyway. "Gay courage" and "disciplined emotion" are her characteristics, he finds, and there were a steel will and energy under her vivacious gentleness.

Mr. Duffus has written an admiring but unsentimental biography and incidentally an able outline of the interaction of a settlement and social conditions through the vicissitudes of the past forty-five years.

CLARA GRUENING STILLMAN

Dunant and the Red Cross

DUNANT: THE STORY OF THE RED CROSS. By Martin Gumpert. Oxford University Press. $2.50.

> This is the story of Henri Dunant: a rich banker, whose interest centered in his business, blundered by chance into the inferno of a battlefield. He became obsessed with the idea of doing everything humanly possible against the inhuman horror of war. His passionate struggle, as a private individual, against political powers and bureaucracies ended with the founding of the Red Cross, but meanwhile his reputation and money had been sacrificed. He was one of Europe's outstanding figures, but with his fortune he also lost his bourgeois status. For years he lived as a beggar in misery and concealment. Decades later the old man, whom everyone had long believed dead, was discovered in the almshouse of a Swiss village. He was awarded the Nobel Prize. He died without ever quitting his almshouse.

THIS is the opening paragraph of the book, and the gist of the whole story. Would that the other 317 pages were as lucid and as free from glaring errors! The subject is a fascinating one. By the side of ruthless "struggle for life," there grew in nineteenth-century Europe a humanitarian spirit, best represented in literature by Hugo's "Les Misérables." In many instances capitalist wolf and humanitarian lamb were one and the same: we find that puzzling blend in Robert Owen, in the disciples of St. Simon, in Nobel, in our own idealistic millionaires. Napoleon III was such a chimera: a realistic-utopian hybrid, incongruously wearing an absurd crown and wielding a futile sword. Between the banker Dunant and the imperial dreamer there was a secret harmony. Dunant saw in Napoleon III the heir to Charlemagne and (a more questionable ancestry) Nebuchadnezzar. Napoleon was responsible for the shambles of Solferino, which struck with horror Dunant's sensitive soul; and the gentle Imperator, remorse-stricken, supported Dunant against generals and bureaucrats. The Red Cross was the result.

Our own Seward rather haughtily refused to join, fearful of European commitments. Meanwhile Clara Barton, the American Florence Nightingale, had started her marvelous work. She wrote to Frances Willard:

> The Red Cross, a little foreign ship . . . runs upon the chains that have shut it out so long . . . "non-intervention," "isolation," safeguarding against "entangling alliances," Washington's Farewell Address, "Monroe Doctrine," apathy, indolence, universal ignorance, national darkness, national distrust, the wish to maintain the barbarous old privileges of privateering and piracy, which we have defended as a precious good against every humane treaty since we began.

Finally, in 1882, America became the thirty-second country to join the Red Cross.

A career of romantic contrasts, a noble enterprise still living and expanding, the stormy background of *Realpolitik* —it was a splendid theme indeed, and we easily understand that it appealed to Thomas Mann, heir to the best traditions of bourgeois humanitarianism. Unfortunately, we cannot share his enthusiasm for Gumpert's handling of his great subject. When Gumpert deals with the generalities of philosophical history he uses a semi-Marxian jargon which is not quite funny enough: "Dunant's presumptuousness, his utter ignorance of the actual horror of death, is only an aspect of *the arch simplicity and egocentric blindness of the capitalist mind.*" This is Soviet-poster psychology. When he descends from generalities to facts, he jumbles them with incredible gusto. This is no professorial carping. I am willing to grant that the spirit should count for more than a few details. But a book which offers itself as history should have some regard for elementary accuracy. A few samples, at random: "Sevastopol fell to the armies of *Marshal Niel*"; the *architect* Haussmann; "Napoleon III, in his overheated room in the *Palais-Bourbon*"; "the French had to keep sending new troops [into Mexico]: after *General Prim* came General Lorencez"; [in 1870] Lord Clarendon died, and *Palmerston* succeeded him"; "Two million pounds sterling had to be paid as war indemnity" (the right figure is two hundred million); "Boulanger killed himself at *his wife's* grave"; such oddities in chronology as the Tangiers episode in 1895, the Sino-Japanese war in 1814, Dunant and Tolstoy, born in 1828, dying in 1910, at the age of *eighty-five.* Hardly any historical work is free from slips, but here the slips become a habit and almost a wilful mannerism. There are mistakes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that are venial, but here the errors are sufficient, in number and in importance, utterly to spoil our pleasure and to ruin our confidence. ALBERT GUERARD

Opera into Tract

A PENNY FOR THE POOR. By Bertolt Brecht. Translated from the German by Raymond I. Vesey. Hillman-Curl. $2.50.

IN 1716 Dean Swift wrote to Pope: "What think you of a Newgate pastoral, among the whores and thieves there?" Passed on to John Gay, the Dean's idea came to fruition in "The Beggar's Opera," which turned out to be the most popular English play of the eighteenth century. Some two hundred years afterward the mirthful correspondences which Gay drew in his Newgate pastoral between high and low life, between people of fashion and the underworld, appealed so strongly to Bertolt Brecht—who excelled as an innovator among the poets and playwrights of Weimar Germany—that he set himself to recreate its basic pattern in a work of his own. Brecht's dry, mock-popular verses, combined with Kurt Weill's music, made of the "Dreigroschen Opera" a most satisfactory and typical production of the post-war stage; and later it was effectively transferred to the screen. Now, working on a more ambitious scale, Brecht deals with the same material cast in the form of a novel.

In this version the original text is almost obliterated. Though its leading characters are retained, they are moved forward into the period of the Boer War; and Gay's key image of the "gang" is extended into a complete generalization of social life. In its passage out of the early eighteenth century into modern times, Gay's light satire on social vices has been transformed into a full-length tract against capitalism. This signifies more than a loss of geniality. In turning the pickpockets, gamesters, and highwaymen of a bygone age and a more homogeneous society into brain-trusters of crime, war profiteers, and chain-store proprietors, Brecht has deprived them, as it were, of their native ideality, of that ceremonial viciousness which not only could be borne but could also charm. The specific qualities of "The Beggar's Opera" are those of a comic ritual, and even the viciousness projected in it is in a sense a form of innocence, for so long as a ritual is held together by social reality, every part of it, even the part of villain, is a necessary and nourishing element in an organic whole. But now Brecht, whose intention in this novel is to introduce an ultimate revolutionary morality and to judge "all who had in any way wronged the poor and defenseless," has changed Gay's pastoral crooks into dehumanized money-grubbers and his pastoral wenches, whose sentimental depravity has its points, into sex machines. In doing so he has been true to history—which has indeed subverted the particular comic ritual to which he has attached himself—but has he been true to the intelligence of art?

For the novel blunders in its humor; its movement is heavy and the plot diffuse, inwardly uncertain of its direction. And it is so, it seems to me, because Brecht has been singularly undiscriminating in trying to fit what is essentially an exposure, a picture of a society in discord, into the framework of a ritual of the past expressing a relatively ordered

THE LETTERS OF LINCOLN STEFFENS

Edited by Ella Winter and Granville Hicks

WITH A MEMORANDUM BY CARL SANDBURG

THEIR INFORMALITY:

The lovable, irrepressible Steffens was not only a great American in the things he did, but in the gifts of his myriad moods and ideas, in his amazing "aliveness." These letters are about human things—falling in love, getting married, getting divorced, spending and saving money, bringing up children, traveling, people. They are full of the kind of things you and your wife talk about after the guests are gone.

THEIR TIMELINESS:

Many of the Versailles letters might have been today's editorials, on Czechoslovakia, Hitler, Spain, England. The Mexican letters deal with the fundamental matters discussed now in the press. They give the living background, explain the personalities involved. In the forefront of history in the making throughout his life, Steffens knew everyone—leaders, politicians, artists, writers, business men—and, like all good reporters, he has the knack of taking you with him in his talks with them.

THEIR WISDOM:

Steffens wrote many letters about the abstractions which worry people today—freedom of speech, justice, democracy, liberty, communism, fascism. He tells what they meant for him as concrete realities. He shows how ideas about them have developed over the past forty years, through national and international events.

THEIR PLACE:

These letters add a new and fuller picture to Steffens' AUTOBIOGRAPHY, give a fresh close-up of the half-century of history Steffens observed. The *New York Times* says: "They may be the best two volumes of letters written in this period. . . . There are none certainly that give a more engaging and endearing picture of a man, or a wider sweep over a tumultuous age."

Two volumes, boxed, illustrated, $10.00

HARCOURT, BRACE & COMPANY
383 Madison Avenue, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every Record Collector Should Own—

MUSIC ON RECORDS

By B. H. HAGGIN

Author of "A Book of the Symphony"

Notes on the music (the important composers, their important works) and a *guide to the records*, with fair warning of poor performances, and of good performances poorly recorded. Section on swing recordings. Indispensable counsel for the record collector. $1.25

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK

THE SELECTED POETRY OF

ROBINSON JEFFERS

The author's own selection of his 125 most important poems, with a new introduction by himself. A "Jeffers' First"!

$3.50 • RANDOM HOUSE

PSYCHOLOGY OF **SEX**

● Price $3. Postpaid. 389 pages
● 5-day. Money-back Guarantee.
If over 21, order at once
● Emerson Books, Inc. Dept. 755-A
● 251 West 19th St., N. Y. C.

New Edition Now Ready

"The best one-volume treatment of sex in the English language."
—*Carl Van Doren*

by HAVELOCK ELLIS

HIS LATEST BOOK ON THE SEXUAL LIFE

To Subscribe to *The Nation* just fill out and mail this form

THE NATION, 20 Vesey St., New York, N. Y.

For the inclosed $..... please enter my subscription for the period indicated below:

☐ Ten Weeks ($1) ☐ Two Years ($8)
☐ One Year ($5) ☐ Three Years ($11)

Name.....

Street.....

City.....

State.....

11-26-38

Extra postage per year: Foreign $1; Canadian 50c

way of life. The underlying pastoral scheme of this novel is in contradiction with its anarchic content. This shows best in the narration of crimes, whose comic edge is blunted by undue emphasis and earnestness, by the involved and detailed documentation of business chicanery. MacHeath, the dashing bandit of the "Opera," is converted into an underworld entrepreneur. Like any respectable banker, he coldly and cautiously plans his profitable raids. The result is that the author is engaged in proving the identity of high and low life rather than in drawing satiric correspondences between them.

Brecht was more successful in the earlier "Dreigroschen Opera," because there he preserved the locale as well as the ideality of Gay's characters. The only change was in the verses, which were rewritten in a manner that served to color with a modern accent the play's nostalgic atmosphere. But in the novel he has gone wrong. It is strange that his Marxism did not save him from overvaluing the continuity of history. The historical method relates the present to the past but does not confound them. PHILIP RAHV

DRAMA

Attention Dies Committee

ANY day now Cole Porter is likely to find himself listed—along with Mrs. Roosevelt and the present reviewer—among the members of the "red network," and when even he goes in for social significance it can no longer be denied that the New Drama has definitely arrived. It is true that "Leave It to Me" (Imperial Theater) bears one of those characteristically neutral titles which make it almost impossible to distinguish by name one musical revue from another and leave the theatergoer wondering whether it was "Sing Out the Good News" or "You Never Can Tell Where We Go from Here" that he saw last week. It is also true that the plot of the new opus is very remotely derived from a farce which was called "Clear All Wires" when presented as originally written by those two notorious revolutionaries Bella and Samuel Spewack. The fact remains, nevertheless, that the exquisite Mr. Porter consents to associate with such people, that he wrote music as well as lyrics for a first-act finale representing a jollification in the Red Square, and that Stalin himself appears on the stage. Moreover, when our ambassador to the Soviets, trying to get himself fired, kicks the Nazi plenipotentiary in the stomach he receives a telegram from the State Department which reads when decoded: "Sock him again." This is precisely the sort of thing classified as "offensive to the heads of a friendly power" and now frowned upon in most countries where culture is beginning to hum. It would certainly not pass the Hays office, and it reminds us again how urgently the stage needs a czar. Or should Mr. Hays, Mr. Landis, and their fellows of the present and future be called Führers henceforth?

Those readers who can still be frivolous will probably want to know that, despite all that has been said, the general method of "Leave It to Me" resembles that of Morrie Ryskind

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or George Kaufman rather more than it does the method of Karl Marx or Granville Hicks, and that it is, as a matter of fact, by far the most amusing of this year's revues. They will also probably be glad to learn that Mr. Porter is still sufficiently "confused" politically—that is the proper phrase, I think—to concern himself with such mere epiphenomena as love, and that as a matter of fact several of his very best patter songs, notably "Most Gentlemen Don't Like Love" and "My Heart Belongs to Daddy," show no awareness of the fact that situations which present themselves to him as merely problems in the psychology of the individual might be more profoundly analyzed through reference to the social system in which such problems arise.

The plot, on the contrary, cuts much deeper. Victor Moore, a successful bathtub magnate from Topeka, is appointed to an ambassadorship because "somebody in Washington doesn't like me," and given Moscow instead of London because he has only five children instead of nine. All his efforts to do the wrong thing in order that he may retire to Kansas despite his wife's refusal to let him resign are so completely unsuccessful that he becomes a local hero and is compelled to stand through a demonstration in his favor which, with characteristic Russian tirelessness, lasts three weeks. But when he tries to do the right thing, when he proposes his own simple plan for the abolition of war and the permanent establishment of peace, he is recalled at once. And if that does not prove that Mr. Porter, the Spewacks, or all three together are approaching a clear grasp of political problems, I do not know what would.

In addition to Victor Moore, the principal performers are William Gaxton, Sophie Tucker, and Tamara. Miss Tucker sings with all the finesse that many years of experience have taught her, and if I may turn now from a discussion of political implications to an equally serious consideration of an aesthetic matter I should like to point the contrast between her methods and those of Mr. Moore. To me at least he is almost too affecting to be funny. His anguish, his bewilderment, and his shyness are so real that I cannot laugh at them with a clear conscience, and when he sings his big aria, "I Want to Go Home," he breaks my heart. Miss Tucker, on the other hand, always manages to tip the audience that wink which puts you at ease with the reminder that her soul is not really being lacerated and that you may laugh at her without being a heartless wretch. In a way Mr. Moore is too convincing, too good. Doubtless it all comes down in the end to the Paradox of the Comedian. Miss Tucker is all art; there is too much nature in Mr. Moore. It makes the whole world kin, and you ought not be kin to the clown whose sufferings are supposed to be comic.

At the Mercury Theater Orson Welles's latest offering is that "Danton's Death" which was acted here in German some years ago. I thought then that my failure to grasp what it was all about was probably due to a language difficulty, but the play seems rather less clear now that I am sure what all the words mean. Mr. Welles has cut drastically, but like the Protestant expounders of the Bible referred to by Dryden he seems "ambitious of the obscurest places," with the result that what you get is a succession of gloomy philosophical dialogues and portentous, soul-searching soliloquies

ARE THE LIBERALS DOOMED?

MAX LERNER SAYS NO!—AND PRESENTS A PLEA AND A PROGRAM FOR COLLECTIVE ACTION TO PRESERVE AND EXTEND DEMOCRACY

Liberalism, and with it democracy, has fallen upon dark days. Believers in democracy, seeing the ground cut from under them by new and vigorous enemies, are groping, bewildered, for a new program which will give them fresh courage.

Against this gloomy background, Max Lerner comes forward with a clear and forthright plan of action. He reviews the growth of liberal and democratic ideas. He reveals the economic forces which shaped them.

And, finally, with challenging vigor he offers a program—economic, political, and social—to solve the questions which are besetting the minds and the hearts of American believers in democracy. It takes cognizance of American traditions. It is sound, clear, concrete. *It can work.*

It is a rallying cry to all who wish to halt the destruction of civilized values. It is a clarion call to all men of good will.

"To my mind it is the very best piece of constructive political thinking that anyone has done in America during the last two decades."—Lewis Mumford.

"A manifesto of the first importance. It ought to serve as a platform for all who understand that the time has come to choose."—Harold J. Laski.

IT IS LATER THAN YOU THINK

The Need for a Militant Democracy

by MAX LERNER

THE VIKING PRESS, New York, N. Y. $2.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, to me at least, conveyed the conviction that all the dramatis personae were in great distress but failed to make clear where the various pains were located. Perhaps I should add that a minority of Mercury patrons were impressed, but that to me the staging of the play seemed as much like a parody of Mr. Welles's method as the play itself seemed a parody of that post-war German pessimism which, as a matter of fact, the play actually antedates by approximately one hundred years.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

FILMS

THE two latest foreign pictures, one Russian, the other French, outstrip the most expensive merchandise of the movie factories. The obvious intention which both films have—to tell uncompromisingly a bit of truth—puts them into a class high above the ordinary level. Anyone who wants more from a movie than "a landslide of entertainment" (as the slogan for one of the stupidest offerings of recent weeks "Men with Wings" runs) will find it in "Professor Mamlock" (Cameo) and "Ballerina" (Little Carnegie).

Professor Mamlock, the hero of the first picture, is a thoroughly assimilated German Jew, cited for bravery in the war, a pure scientist, the head of a hospital in Berlin. After the Nazis burn the Reichstag he is arrested by storm troopers and, with the word *Jude* smeared across his surgeon's robe, driven through the streets like the outcast he will be from now on. With all his beliefs shattered, confronted by the dawn of barbarism in his German world of culture, not understanding how it could happen, he is ready to end his life. At this moment he is suddenly called back to operate on a high Nazi commander who wants the famous professor, Jew or no Jew, to save his life. The professor operates successfully, only to be driven out again as soon as the emergency is over. He tries to commit suicide, is saved, but finally dies under the machine-guns of Black Guards when he appears on the balcony of his clinic and proclaims—speaking to the crowd and the storm troopers in the street—his faith in the ultimate defeat of Nazism. In an equally dramatic parallel sequence the professor's son, whose political interests the father once condemned, develops into an underground worker.

The movie version of this realistic story is based on the German play by Friedrich Wolf, himself a doctor by profession. From S. Mezhinsky's professor, very convincing in his simplicity, to the smallest character, it is acted so plausibly that one often forgets to notice the actors. The street and underground scenes have the documentary intensity of newsreel shots. There is almost no idealization of the oppressed. The dragging in of Stalin by way of a speech seems, unjustly, to limit the active opposition to fascism in Germany to the Communists and reminds many a spectator uncomfortably of the agents of the GPU. This remnant of propaganda should be cut out of what is the best Soviet film in a long time. The young Viennese director, Herbert Rappaport, who like his teacher Pabst has been unable to find a place in Hollywood, has succeeded—in cooperation with the Russian director A. Minkin—in producing the most timely picture for these days of the thousand-fold intensified pogrom in Germany.

The French picture portrays with equal skill and truth to life the full cruelty and sweetness of a little girl's soul. Rose Souris, one of the *petits rats,* as the young pupils of the ballet corps at the Paris Opera are called, adores the *prima ballerina,* Mlle Beaupré, dreams of her steps and pirouettes, worships as relics her old dancing shoes. To Rose life and art alike are beautiful. Suddenly a new star, Karina, is engaged to replace Mlle Beaupré, and the ordeal of Rose Souris begins. To her it means the end of the Grand Opera if her idol is dethroned. The little dancer experiences all the tortures of defeat and jealousy, but with the pure and unrestrained emotions of her childish heart, which no grown-up understands. After the rehearsal at which Karina seems to laugh at Mlle Beaupré, the child has no quiet moment. A psychological sequence, handled with great mastery, shows the ripening of Rose Souris's hatred and her decision to hinder the success of Karina, whose superiority she senses. At the gala opening a little devil in the costume of an angel crawls beneath the stage and releases the catch on the trap door. Karina plunges through the floor and breaks her leg. She will no longer be the competitor of Mlle Beaupré.

But Mlle Beaupré has been protected in vain. She discovers that dancing is not all of life and leaves the opera to marry. Karina becomes the teacher of the rats. Rose Souris fascinates her with her talent and her obsession, and the girl remains her favorite even after she finds out what Rose has done. The film has a happy ending which may not be realistic, but which serves well enough in a work which does not depend on plot. Jean Benoit-Lévy, the director of the unforgettable "La Maternelle," has created another excellent picture in which children are the main players. There is not one second of cuteness or false innocence. The mixture of savagery and tenderness, honesty and crookedness, and above all the readiness to be inspired by the beautiful is given whole. And nothing of the charm and sublime eroticism of the ballet as Degas conveyed it is missed in a touching, unsentimental story told and danced to the music of Chopin and Gounod.

Rose Souris is played by a little genius of a person named Janine Charrat, Mlle Beaupré by Yvette Chauvire of the Paris Opera, and Karina by the great Russian dancer Mia Slavenska. The gracious movements of Rose Souris's fingers, when she imitates with her hands the dance of the Dying Swan, come back again and again to the delighted memory.

The Soviet picture presents a vital subject which no film czar of the democracies dared to touch. Till now their policy of ruling out themes which will arouse the opposition of the dictators or the bureaucracy of the churches has been almost without exception successful. But in a modern democracy which wants to survive, a free press is not sufficient. Free movies and free broadcasts are at least as essential. The French picture demonstrates that children can be presented as children. If our producers could learn that lesson they would spare us many miles of photographed automatons and falsifications of the child mind.

FRANZ HOELLERING

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

The Rearmament Threat

Dear Sirs: The President has again hinted at a vast rearmament program, possibly to replace a public-works program for stimulating business recovery. To many of us this will be a threat because (1) it is not actually rearming but the continuation of a huge and long-run armament plan; (2) it means increased danger of American intervention in European or Asiatic affairs; (3) it will increase the national debt to the point where needed and productive government services may have to be curtailed or omitted.

Those opposing this program will find it supported by the American Legion, the army and navy departments, many advocates of governmental economy, and, worst of all, many earnest workers for peace. I believe that there is only one maneuver which can stave off the almost immediate acceptance of whatever proposals the President may make—a Congressional investigation of our land, sea, and air forces to determine whether they are suited for defense or offense, whether they are efficient, and whether they are worth their price.

Super-patriots will naturally oppose such an investigation as an embarrassment to our government at a critical time. But it would be even more embarrassing to discover our military weakness during a war. Beyond that, the plan will have to depend on the good sense of its proponents and of those persons who constitute the investigating committee.

FREDERICK I. OLSON

Cambridge, Mass., November 10

Let Liberals Unite!

Dear Sirs: If the Republican victories in Wisconsin and Minnesota bring about the downfall of third-party movements, these victories will, in the end, be of great benefit to liberalism. The forces of reaction will not be defeated by guerrilla warfare carried on by the American Labor Party in New York, the Progressive Party in Wisconsin, the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota, the Non-Partisan League in North Dakota, and assorted liberal parties in other states.

Democracy failed in Central Europe because the various democratic groups did not work together. President Roosevelt is trying to make the Democratic Party a great liberal party. If all liberals will join him, I see hope of victory. If the liberals fall apart, they will be defeated in detail.

BLACHFORD KOUGH

Chicago, November 17

Reflections of a Canadian

Dear Sirs: I read *The Nation* and it does me a lot of good. Your fearless defense of democracy is refreshing.

But what can one do—I mean a layman like me? Once in a while I write to the newspapers, but the lickspittle daily press of Canada won't publish anything that's at all "hot."

It is impossible to say what the Canadian view is, but a great number of the fighting men and thinking men are certainly overcome with shame because of Britain's betrayal of small nations and the cause of democracy.

I'm one of the Canadians who, while well on in life, fought nearly four years in Flanders. I really thought I was fighting "a war to end war." But I find now, twenty years later, that it was all futile; ten times worse things are taking place in the world than those we went to war about.

Britain betrayed the League of Nations, betrayed Austria, betrayed Czechoslovakia, and even now, if we can believe the papers, is doing its best to betray Northern Ireland and is going to let down the Jews in Palestine. Talk about honor among nations and scraps of paper! Can any Canadian believe that if Britain ever finds it to its selfish interests, it will not also betray Canada?

It's high time for Canada to cut the painter. The law of geography has ruled that the destinies of Canada and the United States lie in the same direction. As one great and united force they must lead the world's democracy.

Canada's government said nothing in the late crisis. What could it say? This has caused the British government some tall thinking. The King and Queen are coming out next summer. This is to stir up lagging Canadian loyalty.

A CANADIAN

Winnipeg, November 3

Palestine the Only Hope

Dear Sirs: Raif N. Khuri, in *The Nation* of October 29, demanded the abandonment of Zionism and the settlement of the Jews in other lands. But Mr. Khuri should know that the Jews cannot possibly give up their aim. Zionism is today not only a cultural and religious ideal but a strong effort of hungry, persecuted Jewish masses to find a home and to build up their own state. These other places of which Mr. Khuri speaks do not exist. All other states have practically closed their frontiers to Jews. Palestine is our only hope.

The self-sacrificing work of Jewish pioneers has transformed the deserts and swamps of Palestine into flowering gardens. Now the Arabs demand this land, which we have paid for not only with money but with the blood and the sweat of thousands. Mr. Khuri confesses that the Arab bands are fighting for the abolition of Jewish immigration and land-buying. But a regime based on the present numerical relationship would be in reality a dictatorship of the Arabs over the Jews. How would Mr. Khuri bring the Jews to accept such a plan of suicide?

One cannot say that the mandate is unrealizable, for the British government has never tried to carry it out. It has never made laws to facilitate the Zionist task. All the laws of the government of Palestine have been for the benefit of the Arabs. The Jews need (1) agrarian reforms which would make it possible for every Jew who is willing to do agricultural work to build up his own home; (2) industrial and commercial laws to protect our young economy; (3) free immigration for every Jew. Such measures would be a true interpretation of the Balfour Declaration, the treaty between Albion and Israel.

JAKOB KATZ

Brooklyn, November 7

Mrs. Parsons Protests

Dear Sirs: Opinions about books notoriously vary, but when it comes to facts your anonymous reviewer of my new novel, "The Trial of Helen McLeod," in your issue of October 8 owes it to *The Nation's* public to state them correctly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He observes: "Incidentally it isn't the trial of Helen McLeod but of one of her confederates." The trial in question was a test case involving ten defendants, among them Helen McLeod. If the case was won, she would be free; if lost, she would go to jail for ten years.

He states that the trial doesn't begin until page 276. The book opens with the arrest of Helen McLeod and nine others. It proceeds to narrate the moves of the prosecution and defense and the deliberate creation of hysteria in the town. Though the actual court presentation of the case begins on page 276, the whole book is taken up with the trial.

He states: "Three-fourths of the book is flooded with irritatingly irrelevant small talk and rehashes of social theory that may have sounded dangerous in 1920 but today are merely trite." The theories on which the trial turned are precisely the social theories that are today lining up the nations of Europe in warring camps and making every thoughtful American ask where we shall stand when the great controversy of our age topples our peace, as it has toppled Europe's. That great controversy was argued pro and con in an Illinois court by our foremost advocate of the individual's right to freedom of thought and speech. Opposed to him was the hysteria of a town that believed its most precious institutions were menaced.

ALICE BEAL PARSONS

Nyack, N. Y., November 6

Mr. Salomon Replies

Dear Sirs: First let me say that I prefer signing what I write, but when *The Nation* tells me to write a 250-word review, unsigned, then I write a 250-word review, unsigned.

Mrs. Parsons objects to my using nearly two lines of my short space to observe, "And incidentally it isn't the trial of Helen McLeod but of one of her confederates," the inference she draws being that I didn't read the book carefully. But if I hadn't read the book with some care, how would I have known that it *wasn't* Helen's trial? Of course it was a test case, and of course Helen's fate depended indirectly on the outcome, but the fact remains that the novel depicts the trial of Oles Anderson (if I remember the name correctly) and of him alone. I merely mentioned that fact, as a matter of information.

Mrs. Parsons objects to my statement that the trial doesn't begin till page 276. Then she admits that the trial doesn't begin till page 276. As a matter of fact, the point I made, or tried to make, was that the trial—and when I say trial I mean trial—was the only exciting part of the book, and that it therefore was given a disproportionately small amount of space.

Finally, she quotes, bitterly, my sentence: "Three-fourths of the book is flooded with irritatingly irrelevant small talk and rehashings of social theory that may have sounded dangerous in 1920 but today are merely trite," and interprets that to mean that I find the struggle for individual freedom—that is, the "social theory" of the sentence—trite. To me the struggle for individual freedom is one of the most vital subjects in the world, but God knows I find a lot of the rehashings of it trite. I don't say that Mrs. Parson's story isn't a faithful representation of the feelings of the Illinois burghers at that time; I say that today it doesn't sound exciting.

LOUIS B. SALOMON

New York, November 10

Victory Without Fanfares

Dear Sirs: Yesterday I went to a celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Czechoslovakian Republic at the National House of the Czechs in New York. It was a very sad celebration. No one of us thought three months ago that it would be celebrated this way.

I think there were several reasons for our tragedy. The first was the position of our country just at the crossroad, standing in the way of a big, ambitious nation. The second was that we were too small to defend the dangerous spot we occupied without some help from outside. The third reason, perhaps the most fatal for us, was that we so stubbornly believed that the "truth will prevail." No wonder we have been so often deceived. Mr. Hearst in one of his papers wrote recently: "The Czechs had lived for twenty years in a fool's paradise." I should say not twenty years but through the whole of our history—always believing, always struggling for the truth. But were we this time the only fools? Was not the whole world a fool to think a nation of seventy millions was dead for ever?

We have been told that ours was the moral victory. But when was the world impressed by a moral victory? What means for us a moral victory at which we cry our eyes out—a victory without fanfares?

JIRINA MRACKOVA

New York, October 28

Life of Tom L. Johnson

Dear Sirs: I am writing a biography of Tom L. Johnson, member of Congress from 1891 to 1895, mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1909, and supporter of Henry George and the Single Tax doctrine. Should any of your readers possess any material relating to Mr. Johnson I would appreciate their communicating with me, at 1165 Simpson Street, New York. All material sent to me will receive proper acknowledgment and will be returned promptly.

HARRY P. KRAUS

New York, October 30

CONTRIBUTORS

McALISTER COLEMAN is a New Jersey journalist with long experience in left-wing politics.

LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH has covered the Spanish situation for British and American papers since the proclamation of the republic.

ROBERT DELL, correspondent of *The Nation* and the Manchester *Guardian* in Geneva, and known to his confreres as the dean of European correspondents, is now making his first visit to the United States. He will soon start a lecture tour across the country.

JOHN E. KENNEDY is secretary to Congressman O'Connell.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT has for many years been professor of English at the University of Chicago.

ELIZABETH WISKEMANN is the author of "Czechs and Germans."

CLARA GRUENING STILLMAN is a member of the Department of Education of Brooklyn College and the author of a life of Samuel Butler.

ALBERT GUERARD, professor of comparative and general literature at Stanford University, is the author of "Literature and Society."

PHILIP RAHV is one of the editors of the *Partisan Review.*

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 20 Vesey St., New York, Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs, Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED